

# A Handbook of Pāli Literature

# Indian Philology and South Asian Studies

---

Edited by  
Albrecht Wezler and Michael Witzel

Volume 2



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
1996

Oskar von Hinüber

A Handbook  
of Pāli Literature



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
1996

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI  
to ensure permanence and durability.

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

Hinüber, Oskar von.

A handbook of Pāli literature / Oskar von Hinüber.

p. cm. — (Indian philology and South Asian studies :  
v. 2)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 3-11-014992-3

1. Pāli literature—History and criticism. 2. Buddhist literature,  
Pāli—History and criticism. I. Title. II. Series.

PK4503.H56 1996

891'.37—dc20

96-12376

CIP

*Die Deutsche Bibliothek — Cataloging in Publication Data*

**Hinüber, Oskar** von:

A handbook of Pāli literature / Oskar von Hinüber. — Berlin ;  
New York : de Gruyter, 1996

(Indian philology and South Asian studies ; Vol. 2)

ISBN 3-11-014992-3

NE: GT

ISSN 0948-1923

© Copyright 1996 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this  
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or  
mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval  
system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Disk conversion and printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin

Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer-GmbH, Berlin



## Foreword

The original inspiration for this book goes back to early 1991, when Charles Hallisey invited me while staying in Chicago to write a long chapter on Pāli literature for his planned "Handbook of Theravāda Literature". When that plan did not materialize, I decided to publish the section on Pāli literature separately.

This original plan has left its mark on both the structure and the length of the present book. As far as possible, I have attempted to remain within the space limits proposed for the projected handbook, despite the fact that it soon became clear that it would be impossible to deal exhaustively with Pāli literature within those limits. As a result, my presentation is at times extremely brief. Even after deciding to publish the study separately, I persisted with this brevity in order to avoid stylistic inconsistency.

My contribution to the planned handbook was to cover the whole of Pāli literature, with the exception of titles listed by H. Smith in the *Epilegomena* to the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* under 2.9.22 "Medicine", 2.9.23 "Law", and 5. "Philology". These were to be dealt with by J. Liyanaratne, A. Huxley, and O. Pind respectively. Consequently, they are not treated in the present survey.

Despite the limitations of space, I have attempted to deal with as many titles as possible, in order to give a survey of Pāli literature as comprehensive as possible, excluding the group of texts mentioned above. Some of the titles presented in the chapters on later Pāli literature have not been previously noted in modern Western studies. Although it has proved impossible to include all known Pāli texts especially those extant only in manuscript form, the present handbook supplements the *Epilegomena* to the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*.

The selection of later Pāli texts is necessarily somewhat unsystematic, having been dictated by arbitrary circumstances such as the accessibility of printed editions, or of information on the contents of manuscripts. I generally decided to include new or hardly known titles, rather than exclude them only to follow excessively rigid guidelines. At

any rate up to the subcommentaries written in the 12th century all Pāli texts were included.

The sequence of treatment of titles is largely based on that of the *Epilegomena*, which itself mostly follows a traditional Theravāda classification. References to editions and translations already listed in the *Epilegomena* are given in abbreviated form, while references to new ones, i. e. those appearing only after 1948, the date of the *Epilegomena*, are given in full. This bibliographical information precedes the treatment of the respective Pāli texts and is not repeated in the bibliography.

The preparation of this handbook began four years ago, when I gave a series of lectures on Pāli literature at the University of Freiburg im Breisgau during four terms ("Wintersemester" 1992/3 to "Sommersemester" 1994). For this survey the lengthy manuscript that resulted from these lectures has been abbreviated to approximately one third of its original length. I hope to prepare a much fuller history of Pāli literature in future.

The present handbook has benefitted considerably from being read by Th. Oberlies, Freiburg, H. Bechert, Göttingen, and his pupils U. Hüsken and P. Kieffer-Pülz, especially the latter, who checked the manuscript meticulously and made a number of valuable suggestions.

The English was corrected by José Cabezón, University of Denver, Colorado (§ 1–198) during his stay in Hamburg, and by Paul Skandera (§ 199–225) and Birgit Felleisen (§ 226–450), pupils of one of my colleagues at Freiburg, Christian Mair. Peter Skilling, Bangkok, provided me with references and books from Thailand otherwise inaccessible or difficult to find, and S. Hori, Freiburg, translated Japanese material for me. My sincerest thanks are due to all of them for their ready and invaluable help.

Lastly, I am deeply obliged to my friends A. Wezler, Hamburg, and M. Witzel, Harvard University, for accepting the manuscript as part of the new series "Indian Philology and South Asian Studies".

Oxford, 10th February 1996

Oskar v. Hinüber

## Table of Contents

Foreword . . . . .	v
I. Introduction § 1-9 . . . . .	1
II. The Theravāda Canon § 10-155 . . . . .	7
II.1 The <b>Basket of the Discipline</b> § 12-45 . . . . .	8
II.1.1 The Suttavibhaṅga and the Pātimokkhasutta § 14-27 . . . . .	9
II.1.1.1 The Pātimokkhasutta § 15-21 . . . . .	9
II.1.1.2 The Suttavibhaṅga § 22-27 . . . . .	13
II.1.2 The Khandhaka § 28-39 . . . . .	15
II.1.3 The Parivāra § 40-42 . . . . .	21
II.1.4 The Abhayagiri-Vinaya § 43-45 . . . . .	22
II.2 The <b>Basket of the Teaching</b> § 46-128 . . . . .	23
II.2.1 The Dīghanikāya § 52-62 . . . . .	26
II.2.2 The Majjhimanikāya § 63-68 . . . . .	32
II.2.3 The Saṃyuttanikāya § 69-75 . . . . .	35
II.2.4 The Aṅguttaranikāya § 76-83 . . . . .	38
II.2.5 The Khuddakanikāya § 84-128 . . . . .	41
II.2.5.1 The Khuddakapāṭha § 86-87 . . . . .	43
The Paritta § 87 . . . . .	44
II.2.5.2 The Dhammapada § 88-90 . . . . .	44
II.2.5.3 The Udāna § 91 . . . . .	46
II.2.5.4 The Itivuttaka § 92-93 . . . . .	46
II.2.5.5 The Suttanipāta § 94-99 . . . . .	48
II.2.5.6,7 The Vimānavatthu and the Petavatthu § 100-102 . .	50
II.2.5.8,9 The Thera- and the Therīgāthā § 103-108 . . . . .	51
II.2.5.10 The Jātaka § 109-115 . . . . .	54
The Nidānakathā § 111 . . . . .	55
II.2.5.11 The Niddesa § 116-118 . . . . .	58
II.2.5.12 The Paṭisambhidāmagga § 119-120 . . . . .	59

II.2.5.13	The Apadāna § 121–123 . . . . .	60
II.2.5.14	The Buddhavaṃsa § 124–125 . . . . .	62
II.2.5.15	The Cariyāpiṭaka § 126–128 . . . . .	63
II.3	The <b>Basket of Things Relating to the Teaching</b> § 129–155 . . . . .	64
II.3.1	The Dhammasaṅgaṇī § 132–137 . . . . .	65
II.3.2	The Vibhaṅga § 138–139 . . . . .	68
II.3.3	The Dhātukathā § 140 . . . . .	69
II.3.4	The Puggalapaññatti § 141–143 . . . . .	69
II.3.5	The Kathāvatthu § 144–151 . . . . .	70
II.3.6	The Yamaka § 152–153 . . . . .	73
II.3.7	The Paṭṭhāna § 154–155 . . . . .	74
III.	The <b>Paracanonical Texts</b> § 156–180 . . . . .	76
III.1	The Suttasaṅgaha § 157 . . . . .	76
III.2	The Nettippakaraṇa § 158–166 . . . . .	77
III.3	The Peṭakopadesa § 167–171 . . . . .	80
III.4	The Milindapañha (with commentary) *§ 172–180 . . . . .	82
	Milindaṭṭhā § 180 . . . . .	86
IV.	The <b>Chronicles</b> § 181–202 . . . . .	87
IV.1	Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa (with commentary) § 182–188 . . . . .	87
	Dīpavaṃsa § 183–184 . . . . .	89
	Mahāvaṃsa § 185–187 . . . . .	90
	Mahāvaṃsaṭṭhā § 188 . . . . .	92
IV.2	The Extended Mahāvaṃsa § 189 . . . . .	92
IV.3	Vaṃsamālivilāsinī § 190 . . . . .	93
IV.4	Mahābodhivaṃsa § 191 . . . . .	93
IV.5	Thūpavaṃsa § 192 . . . . .	94
IV.6	Dāṭhavaṃsa § 193 . . . . .	94
IV.7	Naḷātadhātuvaṃsa § 194 . . . . .	95
IV.8	Chakesadhātuvaṃsa § 195 . . . . .	95
IV.9	Haṭṭhavanagallavihāraṃsa § 196–167 . . . . .	96
IV.10	Samantakuṭṭavaṃsa § 198 . . . . .	97
IV.11	Saṅgītiyaṃsa § 199 . . . . .	97
IV.12	Anāgataṃsa § 200 . . . . .	98

IV.13	Dasabodhisattauddesa § 201 . . . . .	98
IV.14	Dasabodhisattupattikathā and Dasabodhisattavidhi § 202 . . . . .	98
V.	<b>The Commentaries</b> § 203–322 . . . . .	100
	Buddhaghosa § 207 . . . . .	102
V.1	The Commentaries on the Vinaya § 208–225 . . . . .	103
V.1.1	The Samantapāsādikā § 208–220 . . . . .	103
V.1.2	The Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī § 221–225 . . . . .	109
V.2	The Commentaries on the Suttaṭṭhaka § 226–307 . . . . .	112
V.2.1	The Commentaries on the First Four Nikāyas (Sumaṅ- galavilāsinī, Papañcasūdanī, Manorathapūraṇī, Sārat- thappakāsinī) § 226–244 . . . . .	112
V.2.2	Vimuttimaggā and Visuddhimaggā (with commentaries) § 245–250 . . . . .	123
V.2.3	The Commentaries on the Khuddakanikāya § 251– 307 . . . . .	126
V.2.3.1	The Paramatthajotikā I § 252–254 . . . . .	127
V.2.3.2	The Paramatthajotikā II § 255–259 . . . . .	129
V.2.3.3	Jātakatthavaṇṇanā and Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā § 260–269 . . . . .	131
	Jātakatthavaṇṇanā § 261 . . . . .	131
	Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā § 262–269 . . . . .	132
V.2.3.4	Apocryphal Jātakas § 270–271 . . . . .	135
	Paññāsajātaka § 270 . . . . .	135
	Kosalabimbavaṇṇanā § 271 . . . . .	136
V.2.3.5	Dhammapāla's Commentaries: The Paramatthadīpanī § 272–286 . . . . .	136
	Udāna- and Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā § 277–279 . . . . .	138
	Vimānavatthu- and Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā § 280–282 . . . . .	139
	Theragāthā- and Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā § 283–284 . . . . .	140
	Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā § 285 . . . . .	141
	Dhammapāla's date and his relation to other commen- taries § 286 . . . . .	141
V.2.3.6	The Saddhammapajjotikā § 287–290 . . . . .	142
V.2.3.7	The Saddhammapakāsinī § 291–297 . . . . .	143
V.2.3.8	The Madhuratthavilāsinī § 298–301 . . . . .	145
V.2.3.9	The Visuddhajanavilāsinī § 302–304 . . . . .	147

V.2.3.10	Survey of the Khuddakanikāya-Commentaries	
	§ 305–307	147
V.3	The Commentaries on the Abhidhammapiṭaka § 308–322	149
	Atthasālinī § 315–317	151
	Sammohavinodanī § 318–321	152
	Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā § 322	153
VI.	The <b>Handbooks</b> § 323–354	154
VI.1	The Vinaya Handbooks § 324–339	154
	Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya § 325–331	154
	Khuddakasikkhā and Mūlasikkhā § 332–333	157
	Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśaṅgaha (with commentaries) § 334–337	158
	Vimativinodanī § 338	158
	Sīmā Handbooks (Sīmāvivādavinicchayaśaṅgaha, Sīmālaṅkāra, Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha) § 339	159
VI.2	The Abhidhamma Handbooks § 340–354	160
	Abhidhammāvatāra (with commentaries) and Rūpārūpavibhāga § 340–343	160
	Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (with commentaries) § 344–347	161
	Paramatthavinicchaya and Nāmarūpaparicchada § 348–349	163
	The author Anuruddha § 350	163
	Saccasaṅkhepa § 351	164
	Nāmarūpasamāsa § 352	164
	Nāmacāradīpaka § 353	164
	Mohavicchedanī § 354	164
VII.	The <b>Subcommentaries</b> § 355–382	166
VII.1	The Subcommentaries by Ānanda § 356	166
VII.2	The Subcommentaries by Dhammapāla § 357–366	167
	Līnatthappakāsinī (on the Nikāya-Commentaries) § 358	167
	Līnatthappakāsinī (on the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā) § 359	167
	Līnatthavaṇṇanā (on the Abhidhamma-Commentaries) § 360	167

Paramatthamañjūsā (on the Visuddhimagga) § 361 . . .	168
Nettiatṭhakathā § 362 . . . . .	168
Līnatthavaṇṇanā (on the Nettiatṭhakathā) § 363 . . . . .	168
Dhammapāla's Date § 364–366 . . . . .	169
VII.3 The Vinayaṅgaṭṭhipada by Vajirabuddhi § 367–371 . . .	170
VII.4 The Subcommentaries by Sāriputta and his pupil Bud- dhanāga § 372–378 . . . . .	172
Sāratthadīpanī (on the Samantapāsādikā) § 373–374 . .	172
Sāratthamañjūsā (on the Manorathapūraṇī) § 375–376	173
Kaṅkhāvitaranīporāṇaṭṭikā § 377 . . . . .	174
Vinayatthamañjūsā (on the Kaṅkhāvitaranī) § 378 . . .	174
VII.5 Later Subcommentaries § 379–382 . . . . .	174
Samantapāsādikā-, Atthasālinī-, and Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā- atthayojanā § 379 . . . . .	174
Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-atthayojanā § 380 . . . . .	175
Nettivibhāvanī § 381 . . . . .	176
Sādhujanavilāsini (on the Sumaṅgalavilāsini) § 382 . . .	176
Peṭakālaṃkāra § 382 . . . . .	176
VIII. Anthologies § 383–392 . . . . .	177
Sārasaṅgaha § 384–385 . . . . .	177
Upāsakajanālaṅkāra § 386–388 . . . . .	178
Paṭipattisaṅgaha § 386 . . . . .	178
Maṅgalatthadīpanī § 389 . . . . .	179
Saṅkhyāpakāsaka(-ṭṭikā) and Vessantaradīpanī § 390 . .	179
Paṭhamasambodhi § 391 . . . . .	180
Jinamahānidāna § 392 . . . . .	180
IX. Cosmological Texts § 393–402 . . . . .	182
Pañcagatidīpanī § 393 . . . . .	182
Chagatidīpanī § 394 . . . . .	182
Lokapaññatti § 395–396 . . . . .	183
Lokappadīpakasāra § 397–399 . . . . .	183
Okāsadīpanī § 398 . . . . .	184
Cakkavāḷadīpanī § 400 . . . . .	184
Candasuriyagatidīpanī § 401–402 . . . . .	185
X. Poetry § 403–408a . . . . .	186
Pajjamadhu § 403 . . . . .	186

	Telakaṭāhagāthā § 404–405 . . . . .	186
	Jinacarita § 406 . . . . .	187
	Jinālaṃkāra § 407 . . . . .	187
	Sādhucaritodaya § 408 . . . . .	188
	Jinabodhāvalī § 408a . . . . .	188
XI.	<b>Collections of Stories § 409–418 . . . . .</b>	189
	Dasadānavatthuppakaraṇa § 409 . . . . .	189
	Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa § 410–412 . . . . .	189
	(Madhu)Rasavāhinī § 413–415 . . . . .	191
	Sīhaḷavatthuppakaraṇa § 416–418 . . . . .	192
XII.	<b>Pāli Literature from South East Asia § 419–437 . . . . .</b>	194
	Surveys of Pāli literature composed in Ceylon, Burma and Thailand § 419 . . . . .	194
XII.1	<b>Nīti Texts § 420–424 . . . . .</b>	194
	Dhamma-, Loka-, Mahāraha-, Rāja-nīti § 420–422 . .	194
	Lokaneyyappakaraṇa § 423 . . . . .	195
	Manussavineyya § 424 . . . . .	196
XII.2	<b>Chronicles from Thailand § 425–429 . . . . .</b>	196
	Cāmadevivāṃsa § 426 . . . . .	196
	Sihingabuddharūpanidāna, Ratanabimbavaṃsavaṇṇanā, Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna, Aḍḍhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna § 427 . . . . .	197
	Jinakālamālī § 428 . . . . .	197
	Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa § 429 . . . . .	198
XII.3	<b>Apocryphal Texts from Thailand § 430–437 . . . . .</b>	198
	Sivijayajātaka § 430–431 . . . . .	198
	Sotatthakīmahānidāna § 432–434 . . . . .	199
	Māleyyattheravatthu § 435 . . . . .	200
	Tuṇḍilovāda-, Nibbāna-, Ākāravattāra-sutta § 436 . .	201
	Apocryphal titles mentioned in the Aṭṭhakathā § 437 .	201
XIII.	<b>Letters and Inscriptions § 438–446 . . . . .</b>	203
XIII.1	<b>Letters § 438–443 . . . . .</b>	203
	Saddhammopāyana § 439–440 . . . . .	203
	Mahānāgakulasandesa § 441 . . . . .	204
	Sandesakathā § 442 . . . . .	204
	The letter by the Aggamahāsēnāpati of Siam § 443 . .	204



XIII.2	Inscriptions § 444–446 . . . . .	205
XIV.	<b>Lost Texts and Non-Theravāda Texts Quoted in Pāli Literature § 447–450 . . . . .</b>	206
	Sārasamāsa § 448 . . . . .	206
	Madhukosa § 450 . . . . .	207
XV.	<b>Bibliography . . . . .</b>	208
XVI.	<b>Indices . . . . .</b>	229
XVI.1	Titles of Pāli Works and Their Sections . . . . .	229
XVI.2	Authors . . . . .	236
XVI.3	Pāli Words . . . . .	238
XVI.4	General Index . . . . .	241
XVI.5	Modern Authors . . . . .	248
XVII.	<b>Abbreviations . . . . .</b>	250
XVII.1	Pāli Texts . . . . .	250
XVII.2	General Abbreviations . . . . .	253
XVIII.	<b>Additions and Corrections to the Numerical System of the Epilegomena to the CPD . . . . .</b>	256



## I. Introduction

1. Any survey of Pāli literature is still hampered by quite a few difficulties: Many texts need reediting, some are available only in oriental though partly excellent editions published in Ceylon, Burma or Thailand or exist only in manuscript form. A second difficulty is the lack of adequate research on the subject, and the last, but by no means less serious one is the absence of any theory suiting the needs of studying and describing Pāli literature (cf. § 49 sq.). Consequently, it will be unavoidable to point out problems and open questions more often than offering solutions or answers. Nor does the space of a short survey allow for detailed discussions, which will be found in a comprehensive treatment of Pāli literature under preparation. Therefore, the main purpose of the following is to collect, what is known about Pāli literature and to raise the awareness of deficiencies to our knowledge so as to instigate further research.

2. The classification of Theravāda literature will largely follow the one introduced and used by the Buddhists themselves. An alternative approach would be to treat the texts according to their respective literary genres such as instructions of the Buddha given to his disciples or juridical and philosophical literature, which, taken together, comprise the majority of canonical texts, tales and fables, lyrical or historical poems, epics or gnomic verses. If this presentation was chosen, a comparison with and a history of other literary traditions of ancient India would be desirable, if not unavoidable. This, however, is a task for a rather distant future. This survey therefore, will be limited to Theravāda Pāli literature with very occasional references to the literature in other Buddhist languages.

3. The first comprehensive history of Pāli literature in a European language has been written by Moriz Winternitz (1863–1937) and appeared in 1912 as part II/1 of his “Geschichte der indischen Literatur” (Winternitz 1912, English 1933)<sup>1</sup>. While this excellent book,

---

<sup>1</sup> Important preparatory or supplementary studies are Oldenberg 1898, 1912a, 1917.

still very much worth while reading, is addressed to the general public and to the specialist alike, the brief (35p.), but important, introduction to Wilhelm Geiger's (1856–1943) "Pāli. Literatur und Sprache" (Geiger 1916, English 1943) is meant for the latter only. Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to benefit from Bimala Churn Law's (1891–1969) voluminous "History of Pāli Literature" (Law 1933), because it is difficult to find in this rather verbose book any traces of the scholarly discussion on Pāli literature by Law's predecessors or contemporaries. A concise survey is given in Kenneth Roy Norman's Pāli Literature (Norman 1983)<sup>2</sup>, who, however, was forced by space limitations within the series to concentrate on texts published in Roman script. Consequently, a considerable portion of later Pāli literature had to be excluded. The largest book on this subject written so far has been published recently by Kanai Lal Hazra "Pāli. Language and Literature. A systematic Survey and Historical Study" in two volumes (Hazra 1994). It reads like a remake of Law 1933, and hardly ever takes into consideration the last decades of research<sup>3</sup>.

Finally, a brief, but brilliant outline by Jean Filliozat (1906–1982) on "La littérature Pāli" is found in the excellent French indological encyclopaedia "L'Inde Classique" (Renou/Filliozat 1953). Regrettably, the planned accompanying bibliography has never been published. Many pertinent observations on early Theravāda literature are further found in Étienne Lamotte's (1903–1983) fundamental "Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien" (1958, English with a bibliographic supplement 1988 updated by Webb 1993)<sup>4</sup>.

4. As the Buddhists themselves took a keen interest in their literary heritage, there are early observations on Theravāda literature. Besides many important, though occasional, remarks in the commentaries, the first surviving attempt at some sort of comprehensive approach to the subject is found in a mediaeval history of Buddhism composed by

<sup>2</sup> Additions: Norman 1994.

<sup>3</sup> None of the important contributions by K.R.Norman, not even Norman 1983 (!) has been quoted. The part on Pāli as a language is better passed over in polite silence. — I have not yet seen Jayawardhana 1994.

<sup>4</sup> For further bibliographical references: Bechert-v.Simson 1993: 68sq.; 282sq., Reynolds 1981, and particularly on Japanese publications Nakamura 1980; on histories of Theravāda literature in non-European languages: Bechert 1987a: 134, further Upādhyāy 1972.

Dhammakitti probably about AD 1400 in Siam<sup>5</sup>, the **Saddhamma-saṅgaha** ([Saddh-s]: 4.3.1)<sup>6</sup> “Survey of the Good Doctrine”, which contains as its IX. chapter 39 verses on Theravāda literature beginning with the canon and ending up with works perhaps to be dated into the 13th century. This seemingly random collection of titles is incomplete, with well known texts such as the *Milindapañha* (§ 172) missing and in no recognizable order.

A later systematic survey of unknown date<sup>7</sup> is the **Gandhavaṃsa** ([Gv]: 4.3.3) “History of Books” by Nandapañña discovered in Burma and edited by I.P.Minayeff (1840–1890)<sup>8</sup>. This is followed by the **Sāsana-vaṃsa** (Sās: 4.3.4) “History of the Teaching”, a translation by Paññāsāmī made in 1861 from a Burmese original composed in 1831<sup>9</sup>, which also contains information on books.

The most comprehensive annotated list of titles has been collected in 1888 by Maṇ<sup>3</sup> kṛ<sup>3</sup> Mahāsiriyeasū, the last librarian of the royal Burmese library at Mandalay, which was dispersed when Upper Burma was annexed by the British in 1885, the **Piṭakat samuīṇ<sup>3</sup>** [Piṭakat ihamaiṇ] (**Piṭ-sm: 4.3.[6]**). It comprises 2047 books in Pāli as well as in Burmese and Sanskrit<sup>10</sup>.

5. These are predecessors of Helmer Smith’s (1882–1956) bibliographical list of 1948 in the *Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Tenckner 1924–1991). This systematically enumerates all Pāli texts known to exist at the time, either as printed editions or as manuscripts and refers to the standard editions published by the Pāli Text Society, London, founded in 1881 by T.W.Rhys Davids (1834–1922). These are supplemented by the excellent Burmese edition of the canon with

<sup>5</sup> Penth 1977: 264; cf. also Ras (ed. Matsumura 1992: § 413), p. LXXIsq.

<sup>6</sup> E<sup>c</sup> JPTS 1890: 21–90; N<sup>e</sup> by M.Tiwari, Nālandā 1961.

<sup>7</sup> Bode 1909: X estimates 17th century, because Gv is earlier than Sās.

<sup>8</sup> Minayeff 1887/1894: 235–263 with a short commentary not repeated in Gv, JPTS 1886; N<sup>e</sup> by B.Kumar, Delhi 1992; cf. also Minayeff n.d.: 133.

<sup>9</sup> Lieberman 1976: 136, 139.

<sup>10</sup> Bechert 1979a: XIII; on earlier lists of books cf. ibidem no. 116, p. 172 and Piṭakatayalakkhaṇa, Sās 136,14–18=N<sup>e</sup> 125,16–20. Further works of this type are mentioned by Duroiselle 1911: 120.

In Thailand the Piṭakamālā, of which only two manuscripts are known to exist (the earlier one has been copied in the 17th century), contains a similar list. A catalogue of the library of the Sung Men monastery in Phrae/North Thailand written about 1830 exists in manuscript form.

its commentaries and subcommentaries in 117 volumes published by the Sāsana Council on the occasion of the sixth Buddhist council (Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana) held in Rangoon in 1956, the assumed year of the 2500th anniversary of the Nirvāṇa<sup>11</sup>. A useful Sinhalese collection is the Simon Hewavitarne (1875–1913) Bequest Series appearing since 1911<sup>12</sup>. The Thai tradition is represented by an edition first published in 1893/4 to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the reign of Chulalongkorn (1853–1910, reigned since 1868)<sup>13</sup>. The Nālandā edition in Devanāgarī script has no value of its own, being dependent on the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition.

New editions and translations are listed in the “Buddhist Text Information” published under the editorship of R.A. Gard by the Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions in New York since 1974 until 1993 [1994].

6. All editions are ultimately based on palm leaf manuscripts handed down in the Theravāda countries<sup>14</sup>. Strangely enough, the oldest surviving manuscript containing a fragment of the Theravāda Vinaya has been found in Nepal and is preserved in Kathmandu today<sup>15</sup>. This manuscript, which has been copied during the 8th or 9th century is the only one found outside the traditional Theravāda countries.

Still older remains of Theravāda texts have been found in India and elsewhere engraved in stone and on gold or silver folios (§ 444). The continuous manuscript tradition with complete texts begins only during the late 15th century. Thus the sources immediately available for Theravāda literature are separated from the Buddha by almost 2000 years. It should be kept in mind, however, that the age of the manuscripts has little to do with the age of the texts they contain.

7. Buddhist literature begins with the oral instruction given by the Buddha himself to his immediate disciples. No original text of the very

<sup>11</sup> A most useful concordance between the commentaries of this editions and the corresponding PTS editions is Mori 1994. On epigraphical Burmese “editions” cf. § 446.

<sup>12</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 316. When the widow of S. Hewavitarne died in 1982, she created a trust to continue the work of her husband, and since 1988 the commentaries are being reprinted. — Cf. also de Silva/Uragoda 1995: 18–20 on editions of Pāli texts printed in Ceylon and particularly on the short lived Aluvihāra Series.

<sup>13</sup> On editions of the Theravāda canon: Grönbold 1984, cf. v. Hinüber 1988a: 10 note 29.

<sup>14</sup> Catalogues of Pāli manuscripts are listed by v. Hinüber 1988a: 10 note 29.

<sup>15</sup> v. Hinüber 1991.

beginnings of Buddhism has come down to us. It is even unknown which language the Buddha may have used in his discourses, though it is certain that he did not use Vedic Sanskrit, but a vernacular. As he lived and taught in Magadha, an early form of the eastern middle Indo-aryan language Māgadhī would be a likely guess.

The Theravādins assume as a matter of course that their canon has come down in the language used by the Buddha, which they consequently call Māgadhī as well as Pāli<sup>16</sup>. However, once the linguistic study of Pāli began in Europe by the end of the 19th century, it soon became clear that the Theravāda canon is much later than the Buddha. Further, Pāli has never been a spoken language neither in Magadha nor elsewhere. For it is possible to infer from linguistic peculiarities of this language that it has been created as some kind of *lingua franca* presumably used in a large area at a time considerably later than the Buddha. The evidence, on which these conclusions are based, are the inscriptions of Aśoka (3rd century BC)<sup>17</sup>, which allow to draw a very rough linguistic map of northern India. This map shows that Pāli is rooted in a language spoken in western India far away from the home land of Buddhism. At the same time certain eastern features embedded in Pāli point to the fact that the texts have been recast from an earlier eastern version into their present western linguistic shape<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, it is evident that the texts as found in the Theravāda canon, though the oldest Buddhist texts surviving, are the result of a lengthy and complicated development<sup>19</sup>.

8. According to the Theravāda tradition the texts were compiled at the first council held immediately after the Nirvāṇa at Rājagaha (Skt. Rājagṛha) (cf. § 38). The then oldest living pupil of the Buddha, Mahākassapa – the foremost disciples Sāriputta and Moggallāna had died earlier – presided over the council consisting of 500 monks and had the texts recited as remembered by prominent disciples: Upāli the best expert in Buddhist law recited the Vinaya texts, and Ānanda, who had always been near to the Buddha, the Suttanta texts. Then this form of the text was sanctioned by a common recitation of those monks present at the council and thus the canon was established according to

<sup>16</sup> On the name "Pāli": v. Hinüber 1977 and Pruitt 1987, cf. Bond 1982: 23 note 30.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. v. Hinüber 1986 § 14–21.

<sup>18</sup> For details s. v. Hinüber 1986 § 37–40; 71.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. v. Hinüber 1994b.

the tradition (cf. § 62). It is remarkable that no Abhidhamma texts are mentioned, which clearly shows that this part of the Tipiṭaka was compiled too late to be included into this account (§ 129).

9. For more than one, if not two, centuries the texts were and had to be handed down orally, as there was no script in India<sup>20</sup>. Consequently, the texts were in constant danger of being changed or tampered with by individual monks such as Purāṇa, who came too late to attend the first council and refused to accept the received version of the text, but preferred to stick to the wording as he had heard it personally from the Buddha (Vin II 290,6–8). This is the first hint at a split of the text tradition.

To guard the texts against alterations Buddhists developed at a very early date some means to check their authenticity. These are the four *mahāpadesas* “the great arguments” (Lamotte): a text should have been heard 1. directly from the Buddha, 2. from a knowledgeable community of monks, 3. from learned Theras, 4. from a single competent Thera. Then it needs to be verified as to whether or not the content concurs with Vinaya and Suttantas (DN II 123, 30–126,3 = AN II 167,33–170,11)<sup>21</sup>. This at the same time presupposes some collection against which to check it, some kind of nucleus from which a canon developed<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> v. Hinüber 1989.

<sup>21</sup> Lamotte 1947/1983; Collins 1990: 109 note 18 and Davidson 1990.

<sup>22</sup> Only much later the *vinaya-mahāpadesas* were developed: § 230.



## II. The Theravāda Canon

10. The name commonly used by Theravādins and other Buddhists for their canon is *tipiṭaka* (Skt. *tripiṭaka*) “three baskets”. The origin of and the idea behind this designation are not known<sup>23</sup>. It is however certain that this is not the oldest name used for a collection of Buddhist texts. In the canon itself the *buddhavacana* “Buddha word” is usually divided into *dhamma* “teaching” and *vinaya* “discipline”, to which *mātikā* “the Pātimokkhasutta (§ 14)” is added<sup>24</sup>.

Further, there is a division obviously earlier than the *tipiṭaka* and its subdivisions, such as *nikāya*. It is called *aṅga* “limb, part”, of which there were originally perhaps three, then four, later nine, and in the Sanskrit tradition even twelve items. While the original division consisted of classes of texts: 1. *sutta* “Pātimokkhasutta”, 2. *geyya* “verses”, 3. *veyyākaraṇa* “Suttanta”, 4. *abbhutadhamma* “wonderful events (i. e. an early biography of the Buddha)”, individual names of texts such as *Itivuttaka* (§ 92) were added in course of time as the very early Buddhist literature started to grow. Soon the use of *aṅga* seems to have been abandoned in favour of the *piṭaka* division<sup>25</sup>.

In the account on the first council only the subdivision of what later became the *tipiṭaka*, *nikāya* “group of texts” is mentioned (§ 47).

11. The word *piṭaka* seems to be used as referring to Buddhist texts for the first time in an inscription from Bhārhut<sup>26</sup>. The first Pāli text to mention *tipiṭaka* “three baskets” is the *Parivāra* (§ 40sq.: Vin V 3,14\*), and the perhaps roughly contemporary older part of the *Milindapañha* (§ 175: Mil 18,10; 90,4\*). Detailed surveys about the contents

---

<sup>23</sup> Collins 1990: 92. The Jainas, too, used this word as a name for their canon: Schubring 1935: § 37 and Bhagavati (*Viyāhapaṇṇatti*) (CPD (Epil.) 8.1.5) 25,97.

<sup>24</sup> v. Hinüber 1994c.

<sup>25</sup> v. Hinüber 1994a. I owe the reference to the three *aṅgas* where *abbhutadhamma* is missing (MN III 115,18) to P. Skilling, Bangkok. — The Jaina canon is still divided into *aṅga* and *uvaṅga*. On the division of texts see also Renou 1957.

<sup>26</sup> Lüders 1963: 37, no. A 56; cf. Lüders 1941: 174sq.

of the *tipiṭaka* are found in the commentaries (§ 212; 315). The sequence of texts within the *tipiṭaka* is also shown by the respective arrangements found in the manuscript tradition.

There are still other ways to divide and describe Theravāda texts, discussed at some length, e.g., at Sp 16,18–29,15. Among them are the 84000 *dharmakkhandha* “parts of the teaching”, which is defined as *anusandhi*, Sp 29,10 “connection”<sup>27</sup>.

The only division of the Theravāda canon still in common use is Tipiṭaka, consisting of 1. Vinaya-piṭaka “Basket of the Discipline”, 2. Sutta-piṭaka “Basket of the Teaching”, and 3. Abhidhamma-piṭaka “Basket of Things Relating to the Teaching”<sup>28</sup>.

## II.1 The Basket of the Discipline

**Vinayapiṭaka (Vin: 1.2):** Edition: H.Oldenberg Vin I (1879), II (1880), III (1881), IV (1882), V (1883); translations: H.Oldenberg and T.W.Rhys Davids, SBE XII (1881), XVII (1882), XX (1885); I.B. Horner: Book of the Discipline I (1938), II (1940), III (1942), IV (1962), V (1963), VI (1966). – R.O.Franke: Die Gāthās des Vinayapiṭaka und ihre Parallelen. WZKM 24. 1910 = Franke 1978: 778–865.

Commentaries: Samantapāsādikā (§ 208–222), Vajirabuddhiṭkā (§ 368–371), Sāratthadīpanī (§ 373sq.), Vimativinodanī (§ 338), Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā (§ 379); Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī (§ 221–225), Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīporāṇaṭṭikā (§ 377), Vinayatthamañjūsā (§ 378).

**12. The Vinayapiṭaka** is divided into three parts: Suttavibhaṅga (Vin III, IV), Khandhaka (Vin I, II) and Parivāra (Vin V). The total length of the text is traditionally assumed to be 169 *bhāṇavāras* corresponding to 1.352.000 syllables or 42.250 *ganthas* (*ślokas*)<sup>29</sup>.

The content of the Vinaya is by no means uniform, for, besides law texts, there are also stories, partly of the Jātaka type (§ 113), and

<sup>27</sup> The Majjhimanikāya is said to have 3900 *anusandhis*, Ps I 2,24–30, and the Udāna has 81 *anusandhi*, Ud-a 4,28–32 (Ud-a-trsl “sequential teaching”) in its 80 *suttas*.

<sup>28</sup> A description of the contents of the Tipiṭaka is found in Borsani 1942.

<sup>29</sup> The term *bhāṇavāra* is defined at Sv-nṭ (B\*) I 81,9\*–12\* cf. Sadd 1131: 5.3.3.1 and v. Hinüber 1995b. The number of *bhāṇavāras* found in the Vinaya is given Sp-ṭ (B\*) I 61,11–14: Suttavibhaṅga: 64; Khandhaka: 80; Parivāra: 25; cf. ib. 63,6–26 on the Nikāyas: DN: 64; MN: 80; SN: 100; AN: 120; cf. also Saddh-s 31,9–20.

even passages devoted to a description of meditative practices (Vin III 70,19–71,15, cf. § 70 note 131) or other aspects of the teaching.

13. It is the purpose of the Vinaya to regulate the life within the community (*saṃgha*) of monks (*bhikkhu*) and nuns (*bhikkhunī*) as well as their relation to the laity. These rules may be divided broadly into two parts. The first part of the Vinaya contains the rules, which every single member of the *saṃgha* has to keep, and the second part is concerned with legal procedures. Thus the first part refers to the individual members of the *saṃgha*, and the second one to the *saṃgha* as a whole.

### II.1.1 The Suttavibhaṅga and the Pātimokkhasutta

14. The Suttavibhaṅga “explanation of the (Pātimokkha-)sutta” contains the Pātimokkhasutta<sup>30</sup> together with an old commentary on that text. It is again divided into the Mahāvibhaṅga “great explanation” or Bhikkhuvibhaṅga “explanation (of the rules for) the monks” and the much shorter Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga “explanation (of the rules for) the nuns”. Rules common to both monks and nuns are not repeated in the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga.

#### II.1.1.1 The Pātimokkhasutta

15. The Pātimokkhasutta (Pāt: 1.1), also called Mātikā (cf. § 131), contains 227 rules for monks and 311 rules for nuns<sup>31</sup>. Every single monk has to know them by heart so to join in their recitation every fortnight on the *uposatha*-day<sup>32</sup>.

The Pātimokkhasutta is the only canonical text that has come down to us embedded in a second one, the second being its commentary (cf. § 98). However, manuscripts usually containing only the Bhikkhupātimokkha, rarely also the Bhikkhunīpātimokkha, do exist. The separate existence of this text seems to be guaranteed also by its commentary, the Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī (§ 221).

<sup>30</sup> On the explanation of this difficult name: v. Hinüber 1985b: 60 sq.

<sup>31</sup> Although the content of the Pātimokkhasutta (Skt. Prātimokṣasūtra) is on the whole identical in the different Vinaya schools, they vary in detail. A concordance is found in Pachow 1956: Appendix IV, cf. also Prebish 1979, Pruitt 1994: 53–69, and on Vinaya texts of other schools in general Yuyama 1979.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *uposatha*. On the legal aspects of the Vinaya texts: v. Hinüber 1995a.

The Bhikkhupātimokkha has been edited as a separate text by Nāṇamoli 1966 together with the introduction describing the preparation of the recitation on the *uposatha*-day and with the connecting text found also in the Suttavibhaṅga (§ 26). The respective text of the Bhikkhunīpātimokkha is found in Wijayaratna 1991: 171–195<sup>33</sup>.

16. The rules of the Pātimokkhasutta are arranged in seven groups, to which an enumeration of seven different legal procedures elaborated in the Khandhaka has been added as the eighth part:

1. *pārājika*: 4 rules; nuns: 8 rules; consequence<sup>34</sup>: expulsion
2. *saṃghādisesa*: 13 rules; nuns: 17 rules; consequence: suspension
3. *aniyata*: 2 rules; nuns: – ; consequence: according to gravity of the offence
4. *nissaggiya-pācittiya*: 30 rules; nuns: 30; consequence: giving away a surplus
5. (*suddha*-) *pācittiya*: 92 rules; nuns: 166 rules; consequence: expiation
6. *pāṭidesaniya*: 4 rules; nuns: 8 rules; consequence: confession
7. *sekkiya* 75 rules; nuns: 75 rules; consequence: none (wrong doing)
8. *adhikaraṇasamatha*: 7 items; nuns: 7 items

17. The meaning of these names is understood only in part<sup>35</sup>: The rules of the first group are called “(rules referring) to expulsion (from the *saṃgha*)” using the Vedic verb *parā-aj* found in Pāli only in this context and therefore no longer understood by the Buddhists themselves at a rather early date. The meaning of *saṃghādisesa* is not clear<sup>36</sup>, though the traditional explanation as “the rest (*sesa*, i. e. the duration of the suspension) is with the *saṃgha* (i. e. determined by the *saṃgha*)” may well be correct, if the statement of the judge at the end of Cārudatta’s trial is compared: *nirṇaye vyaṃ pramāṇaṃ, śeṣe rājā*, Mṛcchakaṭika IX (before verse 39) “we (i. e., the judge) are the authority for the decision (i. e., guilty), the rest (i. e., the punishment) is with the king”.

<sup>33</sup> Both texts together with their introductions are also included in Kkh B<sup>c</sup> 1968 1,1–39,22 and 40,1–80,28.

<sup>34</sup> At a later date the consequences of certain rules were differentiated, as in Dharmaśāstra, according to the status of a person, against which they are directed: Vibh-a 382,29–385,35.

<sup>35</sup> For details: v. Hinüber 1985b: 62–68.

<sup>36</sup> Nolot 1987.

18. The legal structure of the Pātimokkha is quite obvious. The rules arranged in such a way that severest offenses are named first and the lightest, the *sekkhiya* “training”, which are rules relating only to a good behaviour in general and which may be disregarded without much consequence, are placed at the end (cf. § 25). The textual structure, on the other hand, shows that the Pātimokkha must have developed over a certain period before it was shaped by some redactor(s) to its present form. Details of this process have never been really investigated and will be the subject of a study under preparation.

By the end of the last century it had been observed already in a preliminary study by H. Jacobi (1850–1937) that pre-Buddhist material had been included into the Pātimokkhasutta<sup>37</sup>. At any rate, the basic rules, such as abstaining from killing (*ahiṃsā*), from sexual intercourse (*methunadhamma*), from stealing (*adinnādāna*), and from telling lies (*musāvāda*), are common to Brahmanical ascetics<sup>38</sup>, Jaina<sup>39</sup> and Buddhist monks.

19. The terminology, however, and the formulation of the rules differ, and Buddhists and Jainas seem to be united against Brahmins in using the terms *methuna(dhamma)* for sexual offences (1. *pārājika* of the Buddhists) and *pāṇātipāta*<sup>40</sup> for “killing living beings”. The latter term did not find its way into the Pātimokkhasutta, where the general rule of *ahiṃsā* has been split: Only the killing of human beings (*jīvita voropana*) is the 3. *pārājika*-offence, while hurting other beings is mentioned only in the 11. *pācittiya*. In the same way it is striking that telling a lie is not a *pārājika*-offence.

The *pārājika*-rules begin by *yo pana bhikkhu ...* “if any monk ...” and thus use a frequent wording typical for both, Buddhist and Jainas<sup>41</sup>, but again unknown to Brahmanical texts. With the exception

<sup>37</sup> Jacobi 1884: XXII sq.: However, the sections from Baudhāyana compared by Jacobi seem to be later interpolations: Olivelle: 1993: § 3.2.1.2; 3.4. Cf. further Hopkins 1923.

<sup>38</sup> Oldenberg 1917: 40 = 1993: 1788 points out that the rules of Pātimokkhasutta replace the Vedic *vrata*-formulas.

<sup>39</sup> On the Jainas cf. Caillat 1965/1975 and Watanabe 1987.

<sup>40</sup> Caillat 1993: 213–216.

<sup>41</sup> The corresponding formulation in Ardhamaṅgadhī is: *je bhikkhu ....* On the other hand the Buddhist do not use rules of the type: *no kappai nigganthāna ...* “it is not allowed for ascetics ...” found in the Jaina Kappasutta (CPD (Epil.) 8.4.2); but cf. § 38.

of the *sekkiya*-rules, which do not seem to have been part of the Pātimokkhasutta originally<sup>42</sup>, about two thirds of the rules begin in such a way. This is true particularly for all four *pārājika*-rules, which can be consequently recognized as reformulated, although their content is by no means typically Buddhist with the exception of the 4. *pārājika* on “the assertion of superhuman powers”. The particular importance of this rule for the understanding of early Buddhism has been rightly stressed by Schlingloff 1985.

20. At the same time the very circumstantial formulation of the 2. *pārājika*, Vin III 46,16–20\*\* on stealing (*adinnādāna*) or the 3. *pārājika*, Vin III 73,10–16\*\* on murder shows that the Buddhist aimed at a very precise juridical definition of what stealing or murder really meant, something quite new in the development of Indian thought.

Other rules are formulated in a much simpler way, such as the 1. *pācittiya*-rule: *sampajānamusāvāde pācittiyaṃ*, Vin IV 2,14\*\* “if there is a conscious lie, an expiation (is necessary)”. Rules of this type are rare, about 10% out of the old Pātimokkha of about 150 rules. All these rules are found in the *pācittiya*-section, and always at the beginning of a group of ten rules. At the same time these brief rules, which link the Pātimokkha to the five *sīlas*, SN V II 68,20–69,17, cf. Khp II. Dasasikkhāpada, and to the ten *sikkhāpadas*, SN V 342,10–343,16, cf. Vin I 83,29–84,4 (cf. § 239), are the only ones in the Pātimokkhasutta, which may be regarded as true suttas (Skt. *sūtra*)<sup>43</sup>. Thus we find here an important hint at the genesis of the Pātimokkhasutta.

21. Both the long sections of the Pātimokkhasutta, the 30 *nissaggiya*- and the 92 *pācittiya*-rules are subdivided into groups of ten (cf. § 30). Within these decades single rules are often connected by concatenation in such a way that certain keywords occur in a sequence of rules, e.g.:

4. *pācittiya*: *anupasampanna*, Vin IV 14–29\*\*: 5. *pācittiya* : *anupasampanna* + *sahaseyya*, Vin IV 16,10\*\*: 6. *pācittiya*: *mātugāma* + *sahaseyya*, Vin IV 19,31\*\*: 7. *pācittiya*: *mātugāma* + *dhamma*, Vin IV 21,18\*\* etc.<sup>44</sup>.

<sup>42</sup> v. Hinüber 1994a: 15.

<sup>43</sup> The Pātimokkhasutta is referred to as *sutta* in the Tipiṭaka: v. Hinüber 1994a: 127sq., on the term *sūtra* cf. Renou 1963 and Gonda 1977: 465.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Schubring 1955, Ticken 1978 and on Prakrit literature Balbir 1995; Falk 1994: 19 on comparable evidence from the Rgveda (cf. § 104).

## II.1.1.2 The Suttavibhaṅga

22. The structure of the Suttavibhaṅga<sup>45</sup> is determined by the sequence of rules in the Pātimokkhasutta upon which it comments. Every single rule is embedded in a text that begins with an introductory story (*vatthu*) describing the occasion on which the rule was prescribed by the Buddha. Then follows the rule as such (*paññatti*), which may be supplemented with additional conditions (*anupaññatti*), and which is accompanied by a word for word explanation (*padabhājanīya*). Finally, exceptions to the rule are enumerated (*anāpatti* “no offence”). Sometimes, e.g., in the 1. *pārājika*, Vin III 33,35–40,25, there is a further paragraph containing exemplary cases assumed to be solved by the Buddha (*vinītavatthu*, Sp 272,2), meant to give guidance to later *vinaya* experts. These divisions are discussed in the commentary on the first Pārājika in Sp (cf. § 216); slightly different names are found in the account on the first council, Vin II 286,23–29.

23. The introductory story does not always really suit the rule<sup>46</sup>. In some cases those monks who created them obviously misunderstood the relevant rule of the Pātimokkhasutta. Thus it is not as astonishing as it may seem, because many rules such as the 6. and 7. *saṃghādisesa* concerning the construction of very small monasteries, were outdated very early, no longer applied and their exact meaning forgotten. It is therefore evident that these stories are separated from the rules by a considerable period of time.

Although some introductory stories have been derived from the rules themselves, others reoccur in different parts of the canon. Thus the introduction to the 1. *pārājika*, Vin III 11,34–17,31 runs parallel to the Raṭṭhapālasutta, MN no. 82, MN II 55,24–65,6 (§ 67)<sup>47</sup>. Here the Vinaya seems to have preserved the older version, because the Majjhimanikāya is much more “Buddhist”, when, e.g., the neutral *tatonidānaṃ bhayaṃ vā chambhitattaṃ vā lomahaṃso vā ārakkho vā*, Vin III 17,13sq. is replaced by the typically Buddhist wording *tatonidānaṃ soka-parideva-dukkha-domanass-upāyāsa*, MN II 64,6sq. in a parallel passage. On the other hand the introduction to the 83. *pācittiya* evidently quotes from the Dasakanipāta of the Aṅguttaranikāya: Vin

<sup>45</sup> Nolot 1994.

<sup>46</sup> This has been discussed in detail by Schlingloff 1964.

<sup>47</sup> The Raṭṭhapāla story has been discussed by Bode 1911, who, however, does not mention the Vinaya evidence.

IV 159,11–160,11 = AN V 81,17–83,9. Sometimes parallels to these stories are found in the Jātakas (§ 113) or even in Vinayas of other schools<sup>48</sup>. The sources of the introductory stories in the Suttavibhaṅga need further investigation.

24. It seems that the commentary on the rules is roughly contemporary with the introduction. The *anāpatti*-formulas, however, seem to be still younger. Moreover, this part of the Suttavibhaṅga is missing in the text of some Vinaya schools<sup>49</sup>.

25. From the point of view of Buddhist law the introductions are unnecessary. Perhaps their existence can be explained by a certain parallelism with the Mahāvagga (§ 31sq.), where rules laid down are related to the career of the Buddha beginning with his enlightenment.

In the same way, the Suttavibhaṅga begins with a text describing this event which is different from the version found in the Mahāvagga (§ 31). The text used in the Suttavibhaṅga has been borrowed from the Aṭṭhakanipāṭa of the Aṅguttaranikāya: Vin III 1,7–6,13 corresponds to AN IV 172,17–179,24. Then the magical powers of Moggallāna are mentioned, and finally Sāriputta, worrying about the duration of the Dhamma asks the Buddha, why the teaching of former some Buddhas did not last for a long period. This is the true beginning of the Vinaya, because the Buddha reassures Sāriputta that he will prescribe rules as soon as a monk will do something wrong.

This interesting remark shows that the redactor(s) who created the Suttavibhaṅga, must have been well aware of the fact that the rules of the Pātimokkhasutta are not arranged “chronologically” but systematically (cf. § 18). For the first offender actually is Upasena Vaṇṇaputta (Vin I 59,32; Sp 194,11), and not Sudinna, whose breach of chastity is the reason for prescribing the first Pārājika.

Perhaps it is not by chance that Moggallāna and Sāriputta are mentioned here, for the first rules are laid down in the Mahāvagga only after Sāriputta and Moggallāna had become followers of the Buddha, Vin I 39,23–44,3. Further, in the Suttavibhaṅga the Buddha first visits Benares without any obvious reason before he meets Sudinna in Vesāli, who will be the first to commit a breach of chastity. Again the

<sup>48</sup> Oldenberg 1912: 981sq.; Panglung 1981; and the important remarks in Schopen 1994: 60sq.

<sup>49</sup> v. Hinüber 1976: 33.



Buddha is near Benares to preach his first sermon at Sarnath as described in the Mahāvagga.

26. The intention to build a general introduction to the Suttavibhaṅga, which runs parallel to the one of the Mahāvagga may be the reason why the original introduction has been replaced. For while the connecting texts necessary for the recitation of the Pātimokkhasutta have been incorporated into the Suttavibhaṅga, e.g. Vin III 109,20–110,2, the general introduction to the recitation still found in the Pātimokkha manuscripts (§ 15) has disappeared altogether from the Suttavibhaṅga, but is preserved in the Mahāvagga, Vin I 102,34–103,11, where it is even provided with a commentary, Vin I 103,12–104,20. Commentaries as part of the text, on the other hand, are typical for the Suttavibhaṅga, not for the Khandhaka, where this is a unique instance. This commentary ends with a reference to the *jhānas*, which still are the main subject of the general introduction to the Suttavibhaṅga. Thus it may be conjectured that some form of the original Suttavibhaṅga introduction perhaps survives here in the Khandhaka.

27. The Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga is built on the model of the Mahāvibhaṅga<sup>50</sup>. It is found only rarely as a separate text in manuscripts, because it has been out of use for centuries<sup>51</sup>. In Ñāṇamoli 1966: 9 it is stated: “but there is no instructing the *bhikkhunīs*, because of their non-existence now.” This sentence supersedes an older wording which must have stood here once, as can be inferred from Kkh 12,6–14,2, cf. Sp 794,20–798,17.

### II.1.2 The Khandhaka

28. While the Suttavibhaṅga has grown around the Pātimokkhasutta another important set of rules is found though not systematically arranged in the Khandhaka. These are the *Kammavācā* (Kammav: 1.2,16) (Skt. Karmavākya), which exist as separate texts in an extremely broad manuscript tradition<sup>52</sup>. These rules have to be recited in different legal procedures of the *saṃgha* such as is the ordination

<sup>50</sup> v. Hinüber 1976: 34.

<sup>51</sup> On the end of the order of nuns in India and Ceylon: Skilling 1993c = 1994b; 1993d: 217, 219 = 1993/4: 33, 34.

<sup>52</sup> Bechert 1979a: 10.

of monks<sup>53</sup>. An edition of the existing manuscripts, which contain differing sets of *kammavācās*, as well as a collection of these rules found in the Vinaya and in its commentary, the Samantapāsādikā, is a desideratum<sup>54</sup>.

29. The name *khandhaka*, which is typical for Theravāda, means “mass, multitude” and is used in the names for the 22 chapters of this part of the Vinaya. Only rarely are these chapters called by other names, such as *campeyyake vinayavatthusmiṃ*, Vin II 307,1<sup>55</sup>, in the account of the second council, for IX. *Campeyyakkhandhaka*, or *uposathasamṃyutte*, Vin II 306,34 for II. *Uposathakkhandhaka*. This terminology, however, is common in other Vinaya schools: The Mūlasarvāstivādin use *vinayavastu* and the Mahāsāṃghikalokottaravādin, *poṣadhapratisamṃyukta*, BhīVin § 294 [35], p. 329<sup>56</sup>.

30. The Khandhaka is divided into two parts: *Mahāvagga* “great division” (Vin I) and *Cullavagga* “small division” (Vin II). The length of the Khandhaka is assumed to be 80 *bhāṇavāras* (§ 12), which seems to be too long, for a rough calculation allows only for 60 and certainly not more than 70 *bhāṇavāras*. Therefore, the figure 80 may be suspected as being influenced by the “Vinaya in 80 recitations” known to the (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda tradition<sup>57</sup>.

The Mahāvagga contains ten, and the Cullavagga twelve, Khandhakas. As the last two Khandhakas of the Cullavagga give the account of the first two councils (cf. § 8), these may be later supplements to a Khandhaka being divided into decades, just as, e.g., the Nissaggiya- and Pācittiya-sections of the Suttavibhaṅga (§ 21).

31. The inner structure of the Khandhaka seems to be as follows. The Mahāvagga begins with the enlightenment (cf. § 25), which is the starting point for the foundation of the Buddhist order soon afterwards, and with the relevant rules for the ordination of monks. At the very end of the Cullavagga the account of the second council held at Vesālī (Skt. Vaiśālī) refers to the origins of Theravāda. This historical narrative holds the text together as a bracket.

<sup>53</sup> v. Hinüber 1987.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Bechert 1977a: 56 and Frankfurter 1883: 141–150.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Sp 962,9.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Roth 1970: XLI sq.

<sup>57</sup> On the (Mūla)Sarvāstivāda tradition: Lamotte 1958: 191/1988: 174.

After having introduced the lower (*pabbajjā*) and higher (*upasampadā*) ordination in I. Mahākhanda, the II.-IV. Khandhaka describe the procedures connected to important events of the ecclesiastical year. Other chapters contain highly technical legal matters such as VII. Kaṭṭhakkhandhaka on robes or IX. Campeyyakkhandhaka on different procedures. This continues in the first four chapters of the Cullavagga. The chapter, which originally perhaps was the last one, is devoted to the foundation of the order of nuns: X. Bhikkhunikkhandhaka<sup>58</sup>. This again runs parallel to the Suttavibhaṅga ending with the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga.

32. The structure of the Vinaya has been investigated by E. Frauwallner (1898–1974) in his fundamental book “The earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature<sup>59</sup>”. Frauwallner compares those parts of all extant Vinayas corresponding to the Theravāda Khandhaka, and tries to demonstrate that in a huge literary work carefully planned by some redactor all rules were related to the life of the Buddha. In course of time parts broke away from this assumed Ur-Khandhaka, such as a text corresponding to the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta of the Dīghanikāya (§ 60), having stood at its end originally.

This view of Frauwallner was criticized almost at once by Lamotte<sup>60</sup>, who rightly maintains that the different Vinayas grew into different directions<sup>61</sup>.

Other important points in Frauwallner's book have been accepted, such as the basic idea that there is a plan behind the structure of the Khandhaka. In contrast to Frauwallner, however, this structure rather seems to follow a plan outlined above (§ 31). The existence of a structure comprising the whole Khandhaka at the same time means that this is the first successful attempt to compose a really long text in the history of old Indian literature<sup>62</sup>, longer still than the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta (§ 60).

Further, Frauwallner seems to be right in pointing out that the model for the Khandhaka can be found ultimately in the Brāhma-

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Hüsken 1993.

<sup>59</sup> Frauwallner 1956.

<sup>60</sup> Lamotte 1958/ 1988: 193sq./ 176sq.

<sup>61</sup> An probable example for the expansion of the Vinaya is discussed in Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 51sq.

<sup>62</sup> v. Hinüber 1989: 24.

nas<sup>63</sup>. Just as the rules for the ritual are not simply enumerated there but also explained, the Buddhist Vinaya, too, gives explanations as to why the rules had to be prescribed. The Buddhists, though, have gone far beyond the simple structure of small Brāhmaṇa texts when they assembled their laws and created the Vinaya<sup>64</sup>.

33. If the collection of Suttantas in the Suttapiṭaka is compared to the Vinaya, there is hardly any trace of a systematic order. Each text is a unit of its own very often without recognizable connection to the previous or to the following ones.

It is, however, not only in regard to the systematic arrangement that the Vinaya differs from the Suttanta collection. Even at first glance it is striking that the stereotyped beginning of a Suttanta “thus have I heard. At a certain time the Buddha stayed at ...” (§ 53) is alien to the Vinaya, where texts begin with “at that particular time the Buddha stayed at ...”. This difference has not escaped the attention of the commentaries. They explain the expression “at that particular time” as referring to the time when a certain rule has been prescribed.

The difficulty remains, however, why the Suttavibhaṅga and the Khandhaka begin in this way, where a reference to a rule is excluded. The commentary has no answer: “it is traditionally like this”, Sp 950,24. This could be explained as follows: The redactor(s) of the Khandhaka wanted to avoid the traditional beginning of the Suttantas, because they consciously created a new text as a whole which was not a mere collection of many single texts, such as the individual Suttantas. If this is true, then it was obvious just to leave out the very beginning of a Suttanta and to begin with the second sentence: *evaṃ... ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā Rājagahe viharati ... tena kho pana samayena ... Ajātasatthu ... Vajjī abhiyātukāmo hoti*, DN II 72,2sq.

34. As in the Suttavibhaṅga, in the Khandhaka, too, texts are found which have been taken over from the earlier Suttapiṭaka. It is interesting to note that in these cases the beginning of the text has been adjusted to the new context: the Suttanta introduction has been dropped to fit the relevant text into the Vinaya<sup>65</sup>. These parallel texts, which still

<sup>63</sup> Frauwallner 1956: 62; Lamotte 1958/1988: 194/176.

<sup>64</sup> On the different styles of the Brāhmaṇas and the early Buddhist prose see Oldenberg 1917.

<sup>65</sup> v. Hinüber 1989: 25.

need detailed investigation are as important for the relative dating of texts as for the structure of the single chapters of the Khandhaka.

35. Parallels, however, are found also within the Vinaya itself. A paragraph important in this respect is the conversion of the three Kassapas by the Buddha, Vin I 24,10–25,37, where the same event is told first in prose and then again in *āryā*-verses. The whole paragraph has been discussed in detail by L. Alsdorf (1904–1978)<sup>66</sup>, who has drawn attention to the fact that the use of the *āryā*-metre can be used for dating texts<sup>67</sup>. For this particular metre was in use only in India, and not in Ceylon. Consequently, if the tradition that Mahinda brought texts from India to Ceylon is correct, this text must be older than about 250 BC<sup>68</sup>. At the same time this sequence of prose and verse corresponds to a type of literature found in the Jātakas<sup>69</sup>.

36. Besides material relating to Buddhist law, even the Theravāda Vinaya contains quite a few stories. In course of the development of Vinaya texts more and more stories were incorporated, so much so that, e.g., Cullavagga VII. Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka “chapter on splitting the order”, which comprises 26 printed pages in the Theravāda version has been expanded into more than 500 pages in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya. Thus the law texts are slowly overgrown with stories, to such an extent that there is almost a change of the literary genre, from law book to *Avadāna*<sup>70</sup>.

37. Both Suttavibhaṅga and Khandhaka have a long history of development and of mutual influence. The oldest part of the Suttavibhaṅga, the Pātimokkhasutta, is separated by a considerable span of time from later ones, such as the *anāpatti*-formulas, which mention the Abhidhamma texts, and perhaps even script. On the other hand, Cullavagga IV. Adhikaraṇasamathakkhandhaka knows the Suttavibhaṅga, Vin II 96,30sq.

<sup>66</sup> Alsdorf 1967: 51–77.

<sup>67</sup> Alsdorf 1965: 69sq.

<sup>68</sup> In his review of Alsdorf 1967, de Jong 1972: 210 raises serious doubts about the trustworthiness of this tradition.

<sup>69</sup> Alsdorf 1967: 60 note 2.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Udānavarga and Dhammapada § 89. — The Chinese pilgrim I-tsing complains about the predelection for stories and the neglect of law in the Vinaya: Barreau 1992: 46.

~~A preliminary model of the development of Suttavibhaṅga and Khandhaka may be sketched as follows:~~ First the Pātimokkhasutta is created by incorporating older pre-Buddhist material, mostly by reformulating the rules, and by providing the framework necessary for recitation that is the introduction to the individual rules and the connecting texts between the groups of rules. Then a commentary on this text develops, of which a part survives in the Mahāvagga (§ 26). Perhaps roughly contemporary is a first draft of the Khandhaka, possibly having only ten chapters<sup>71</sup>, by which the growing Suttavibhaṅga is influenced. The introductory stories are developed, which do not always understand the rules correctly. This points to a certain distance in time between these two parts of the Suttavibhaṅga. Here it is important to note that there are no such misunderstandings in the Khandhaka, because the author(s) could drop rules no longer understood, which is not possible in the fixed Pātimokkhasutta: *suttaṃ hi appaṭivattiyaṃ*, Sp 231,26 “for it is impossible to revoke the (Pātimokkha-)sutta.” At this point there may have been a revision of the Khandhaka, to which the highly technical and later (?) legal chapters are added and thus the number of twenty chapters is reached. The original introduction to the Suttavibhaṅga is replaced and brought into the Mahāvagga.

38. Finally, the accounts of the councils (§ 8) may have been added as an appendix<sup>72</sup>. Particularly the account of the second council may have belonged originally to a non-Theravāda tradition, as Lamotte stresses<sup>73</sup>, although no actual split of the Theravāda tradition is mentioned here<sup>74</sup>. The terminology also differs from what is common in Theravāda (§ 29): Formulations such as *kappati ... siṅgilonakappo*, Vin II 306,13 are otherwise alien to the language of the Vinaya, but astonishingly near to the Jaina Kappasutta (§ 19 note 41). Further, the monks obviously do not understand all the key words, which are unknown or at least unfamiliar to them, with the exception of the last two: the Theravāda Vinaya experts have to ask for an explanation for eight out of ten items as stressed by Lamotte.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. the Daśādhyaya-(perhaps rather Daśabhāṇavāra-?) Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādin (?), Lamotte 1958: 185/1988: 168.

<sup>72</sup> Lamotte 1958: 146/1988: 133.

<sup>73</sup> Lamotte 1958: 144/1988: 131.

<sup>74</sup> That occurred only at Pāṭliputra: Dīp V 30 sq.

39. Even if this first and very much conjectural outline of a possible development is on the whole not too far from the truth, it would be difficult to convert this relative into an absolute chronology. Only in very general terms might it be conjectured that most if not all of this happened before the Vinaya was brought to Ceylon (cf. § 35). For a Vinaya was needed most to introduce Buddhism to Ceylon, and there are no hints as to additions to the Suttavibhaṅga or Khandhaka which refer to the island<sup>75</sup>.

### II.1.3 The Parivāra

40. Although other Vinaya schools possess appendices to the Vinaya, a handbook giving a systematic survey of law exists only in Theravāda (cf. § 166). The Parivāra (Vin V) is a highly technical text that has been put together from parts originally quite independent from each other and which sometimes even repeat the discussion of some Vinaya problems. The text concentrates on legal matters leaving aside all framework. At the end, the author or perhaps redactor, named Dīpa (Vin V 226,5\*) is mentioned, who is not known otherwise. The translation of the title is not entirely clear, perhaps “appendix<sup>76</sup>”; it occurs in the text itself, Vin V 86,15\*. An investigation into this highly important handbook is necessary<sup>77</sup>.

41. The Parivāra consists of 19 chapters, but it is called in the commentaries *soḷasaparivāra*, Sp 18,5=Sv 17,4 “appendix of 16 (chapters?)”. Further, some manuscripts state at the end of the 14th chapter that “the Parivāra has come to an end” (Vin V 179,19. cf. § 174). There is indeed a rather clear break in the Parivāra after this chapter, because XV. Upālpañcaka reads like a text from the Khandhaka beginning with *tena samayena...*, Vin V 180,2. However, the structure of the Parivāra has never been investigated, and therefore the supposed original end of the text after XIV. Kaṭṭhinabheda remains an open question. In addition there is no trace of a Parivāra with 16 chapters. It is only in the phrases *mahāvibhaṅge mahābhede soḷasa mahāvārā*, Vin V 53,16 and *bhikkhunīvibhaṅge soḷasa mahābheda*, Vin V 85,34 at the end of the first two chapters that the figure 16 occurs. In spite of the fact that

<sup>75</sup> On these chronological problems cf. v. Hinüber 1989: 41–54.

<sup>76</sup> Sometimes BHSD is quoted to support this meaning. However, BHSD is based on the presumed signification of the word in the name of this Pāli text.

<sup>77</sup> v. Hinüber 1992.

we find *vāra* here and not *parivāra*, it is possible that the text has been named after the first chapters<sup>78</sup>.

42. As we have it, the *Parivāra* presupposes *Suttavibhaṅga* and *Khandhaka*, from which it is totally different in style. The text begins with questions and answers without mentioning the Buddha or any other person. One of the questions concerning the tradition of the *Vinaya* is most important for the history of this text. A line of forty persons beginning with the Buddha and *Upāli* is mentioned enumerating prominent *Vinaya* teachers, *Vin V* 2,36\*-3,30\* (cf. § 133). The last in the line is *Sīvatthera*, who may have lived in the 1st century AD<sup>79</sup>, and this is a most probable *terminus post quem*<sup>80</sup> for the *Parivāra*.

### II.1.4 The *Abhayagiri-Vinaya*

43. Traditionally there were three Theravāda fraternities in *Anurādhapura* in Ceylon based in three monasteries<sup>81</sup>, each of which once possessed texts of their own. When *Parakkamabāhu I.* (1153–1186) reformed Buddhism in Ceylon during the 12th century (§ 372), the monks of the *Abhayagiri-* and the *Jetavana-vihāra* were reordained according to the *Mahāvihāra* tradition. Consequently, their texts gradually disappeared, and the only Theravāda texts surviving are those of one single monastery, the *Mahāvihāra*<sup>82</sup>.

It is known that the *Vinaya* of the *Abhayagirivihāra* differed from the one of the *Mahāvihāra*, particularly the *Khandhaka* and the *Parivāra* as explicitly stated in the commentary to the *Mahāvamsa*, *Mhv-ṭ I* 175,31sq. ad *Mhv V* 13 (§ 188). Fortunately, this is corroborated by a single sentence from the *Abhayagiri-Vinaya*, corresponding to *Vin II* 79,21=III 163,1, quoted in the *Vinaya* commentary (*Sp* 583,9sq.), which shows that the wording was indeed slightly different<sup>83</sup>.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the names of the three parts of DN: § 52.

<sup>79</sup> *Adikaram* 1946: 85sq.

<sup>80</sup> *Norman* 1983: 26 has 1st century BC, and *Lamotte* 1958: 147 has “V<sup>e</sup> siècle”, which must be a misreading of “V” in a handwritten manuscript for “I”; *Lamotte* 1988: 134 “fifth century”.

<sup>81</sup> *Geiger* 1960/1986: 209 § 202.

<sup>82</sup> *Bechert* 1993: 16.

<sup>83</sup> For a full discussion see v. *Hinüber* 1995a: 37; a second instance is perhaps *Kkh-ṭ B<sup>c</sup>* (1965) 114,6sq. ad *Kkh* 172,14.



44. Starting from this information V.Stache-Rosen (1925–1980) believed to have discovered the Abhayagiri-Parivāra in the Chinese translation of the Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra, which shows a certain similarity with, and even contains passages which run parallel to, the Mahāvihāra-Parivāra.

This idea, however, has not found universal approval<sup>84</sup>. Particularly de Jong has pointed out in his review<sup>85</sup> that there is nothing to support the assumed translation of this text from the Pāli. Further, as Stache-Rosen herself has observed<sup>86</sup>, the sequence of Vinaya rules does not correspond to the Mahāvihāra-Pātimokkhasutta, nor to that of any other Vinaya school. Thus the problem of the affiliation of the Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra cannot be solved at present. With only the Chinese translation available, and the Indian original probably lost, a solution may even be impossible<sup>87</sup>.

45. Finally, it should be remembered that the Chinese translation of the Samantapāsādikā (§ 209) contains the full text of Parivāra XVII. Dutiya-gāthā-saṃgaṇikā “second collection of stanzas” together with its commentary, but does not comment on any other part of the Parivāra<sup>88</sup>.

## II.2 The Basket of the Teaching

46. While the Vinayapiṭaka has Buddhist law as its central topic, the Suttapiṭaka, contains a large variety of texts differing widely in their literary form and content.

The Vinayapiṭaka is named after its contents, the Buddhist law. Correspondingly, the second Piṭaka could have been called “Dhammapiṭaka”. Here, however, the name of the literary form, Sutta(ṇṭa), prevalent in the first four Nikāyas has been chosen to designate this part of the Tipiṭaka<sup>89</sup>.

<sup>84</sup> Norman 1991: 44sq.

<sup>85</sup> de Jong 1986.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. also Matsumura 1990: 63sq.

<sup>87</sup> On Vinaya texts connected to Upāli cf. Python 1973: 5.

<sup>88</sup> For further evidence of Abhayagiri texts: Bv: § 125; Dīp § 184; Mhv-ṭ § 188; Vim § 250; Saddh § 439.

<sup>89</sup> The problem of the name *suttanta* for these texts has been discussed in v. Hinüber 1994a: 125–132; on earlier attempts to arrange the texts of the canon § 10.

47. The Suttapiṭaka is divided into five *nikāyas* “groups (of texts)”. The first four comprise mainly the discourses of the Buddha and his discussions with disciples and heretics alike. The last Nikāya differs from the first four, because it comprises a large variety of heterogeneous texts (§ 84).

The term *nikāya* is typical for Theravāda to designate these subdivisions. Other schools prefer *āgama*, which is not totally alien to Theravāda either<sup>90</sup>. It is first of all Buddhaghosa who uses *āgama* instead of *nikāya* (§ 226 note 398) in the introductions to his commentaries.

On the whole the names of the Nikāyas are uniform in the Buddhist tradition, with the exception of the name of the fourth Nikāya:

1. Dīghanikāya “group of long texts” – Dīrghāgama
2. Majjhimanikāya “group of middle (length) texts” - Madhyamāgama
3. Saṃyuttanikāya “group of connected texts” – Saṃyuktāgama
4. Aṅguttaranikāya “group of texts (containing) an increasing (number of) items” – Ekottarāgama
5. Khuddakanikāya “group of small texts” – Kṣudrakāgama/Kṣudrakapiṭaka

Rarely in Theravāda also the name Ekuttara occurs instead of Aṅguttaranikāya (§ 76).

48. The number of Suttantas varies greatly in the first four Nikāyas: There are 34 in the Dīgha-, 152 in the Majjhima-, and according to the tradition 7762 in the Saṃyutta-, and 9557 in the Aṅguttaranikāya, Sv 22,31–23,22<sup>91</sup>.

49. Before discussing the individual Nikāyas, it may be useful to briefly reflect on possible methods of how to handle such a vast mass of texts. Some of these deliberations would also apply for the Vinayapiṭaka.

Two basic facts have to be considered first: the Buddhist canon belongs to the class of anonymous literature. It has not been shaped by one single author, but it has been growing over a long period of time. In contrast to the Vinayapiṭaka, which was finally arranged in

<sup>90</sup> CPD s.v. *āgama*; Buddhist Sanskrit texts occasionally also use *nikāya*, BHSD s.v. and *caturṇām sūtranikāyānām*, GM III 4,139,18 : *suttanta*, Vin I 140,36.

<sup>91</sup> The figures for SN and AN are not clear: §§ 70, 77. – On the number of *bhāṇavāras* “units for recitation” of the individual Nikāyas cf. § 12 note 29.

accordance to a general plan (§ 31sq.), the Suttantas have been simply placed together. There are, however, two completely different principles of the arrangement of Suttantas. In the first three Nikāyas it is the decreasing length of the texts. In the Aṅguttaranikāya, on the other hand, sets of persons, things or concepts occurring once, twice, thrice etc. are grouped together in separate divisions.

The second important fact is that this literature has been handed down orally for a considerable time. As far as the Suttapiṭaka is concerned this task was entrusted to the *bhāṇakas* “reciters”<sup>92</sup>. These *bhāṇakas* may also have been the redactors of the texts, if the information that the Dīghabhāṇakas incorporated the Khuddakanikāya into the Abhidhammapiṭaka (§ 85) is taken into consideration.

It is important for the tradition that the *bhāṇakas* specialized in individual Nikāyas, because this may be one of the reasons why parallel texts were created. Every branch of specialists endeavored to have some knowledge on all important aspects of teaching in their respective repertoire: “with the help of one Nikāya, questions relating to the remaining Nikāyas can be answered”, Sp 790,3 (cf. § 226).

50. Thus the situation of the text tradition of the Buddhist canon is in some respects rather similar to that of the Purāṇas. Consequently, it would be possible and promising to apply the methods developed by W.Kirfel (1885–1964) and P.Hacker (1913–1979) for the anonymous Purāṇa literature also to Buddhist texts, and to create a synopsis corresponding to the Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa<sup>93</sup> for the Theravāda canon to find out which texts are actually repeated in the canon and which are unique.

So far this has not been done. Even studies on the structure of Theravāda literature are rare, for although H.Oldenbergh (1854–1920) or R.O.Franke (1862–1928) started research in this direction long ago, they did not find many successors<sup>94</sup>. Rare exceptions are two Indian scholars, G.C.Pande and D.K. Barua, who tried to separate older and younger layers in the Theravāda canon without, however, finding any proper methodological means to do so<sup>95</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> Adikaram 1946: 24sq.; there are no *bhāṇakas* for the Vinaya, which has been handed down by the *vinayadharas* “bearers of the Vinaya”.

<sup>93</sup> Kirfel 1927, Hacker 1959, cf. also Collins 1990: 99sq.

<sup>94</sup> Oldenbergh 1917; Franke’s work has been collected in Franke 1978.

<sup>95</sup> Pande 1957, 2nd ed. 1974, criticism in Hamm 1961: 206–210 and Norman 1983: X; Barua 1971.

— 51. Another aspect of early Buddhist (prose) literature is very different from the (metrical) Purāṇas, for early oral Buddhist texts have been strongly shaped by the use of formulas, about which fairly little is known so far in detail<sup>96</sup>. This is a feature common to Buddhist and Jaina literature, and again separating both of them from the Veda. As far as this can be seen today, Buddhist and Jaina texts are rooted in a second literary tradition once existing side by side with the Vedic literature, but completely lost except for the literary form as preserved and used by those who shaped the early oral Buddhist and Jaina texts<sup>97</sup>.

On the other hand, there are of course connections to the still earlier and partly contemporary Vedic literature. Some recent studies have added to our knowledge in this respect<sup>98</sup>.

Lastly, as far as the dating of texts is concerned, Buddhist literature can be compared to the development of the material culture in ancient India, which, e.g., shows that the cultural environment of the first four Nikāyas of the Suttapiṭaka is markedly older than that of the Vinayapiṭaka.

Once all these methodological possibilities have been used to uncover the development of early Buddhist texts, this could and must be compared to the development of Buddhism as a religion<sup>99</sup>.

It is obvious that research has a long way to go to achieve all this. Due to the lack of much preliminary study that is still necessary, special attention will be paid in the following to one aspect only, that is, the literary form of the texts.

### II.2.1 The Dīghanikāya

**Dīghanikāya (DN: 2.1):** Edition: T.W.Rhys Davids and J.Estin Carpenter I (1890), II (1903), III (1911); Canon Bouddhique Pāli (Tipiṭaka). Texte et Traduction. Suttapiṭaka Dīghanikāya par J.Bloch, J.Filliozat, L.Renou. Tome I, Fasc. 1 (Suttantas 1–3, all published, transcript of K<sup>o</sup>); Renou 1987; translations: T.W. and C.A.F.Rhys Davids:

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Allon 1994 and Gethin 1992.

<sup>97</sup> Bechert 1988 and 1991b; v. Hinüber 1994b: 33.

<sup>98</sup> Falk 1988, Gombrich 1988=1990; Horsch 1966, and, still important, Oldenberg 1915; cf. also § 56 note 108.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Vetter 1988 [reviews: R.Gombrich, JRAS 1990. 405–407; H.Bechert, ZDMG 142.1992,210 sq.; E.Steinkellner, WZKS 36.1992,237–239; J.Bronkhorst, IJ 36.1993,63–68].

Dialogues of the Buddha. London I (1899), II (1910), III (1921); R.O.Franke (1913); M.Walshe: *Dīgha Nikāya*. Thus I Have Heard: The Long Discourses of the Buddha. London 1987.

Commentaries: *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (§ 226–244), *Linatthappakāsinī* (§ 358), *Sādhujanavilāsinī* (§ 382).

52. The DN contains 34 Suttantas divided into three groups:

1. *Sīlakkhandhavagga*, nos. 1–13
2. *Mahāvagga*, nos. 14–23
3. *Pāṭikavagga*, nos. 24–34

These names, of uncertain date, have been taken from the respective first Suttanta: the very first Suttanta of DN, the *Brahmajāla* is the only one divided into three subdivisions, *Cūḷa-*, *Majjhima-*, and *Mahā-sīla* “small, middle, great division on good character”. The titles of the Suttantas of the second Vagga begin with *Mahā-* “great”, and finally the third Vagga begins with the *Pāṭikasuttanta*. This is a purely formal division with no immediate connection to the content of the respective parts of DN<sup>100</sup>.

53. The beginning of a Suttanta is fixed: *evaṃ me sutam. ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā ... viharati ...* “thus have I heard. At a certain time the Buddha ... stayed (at) ...<sup>101</sup>”. The next sentence usually names the principal interlocutor of the Buddha<sup>102</sup>. This introduction has been discussed at length in the various commentaries on the Pāli canon (§ 230) and frequently again in modern times<sup>103</sup>.

This beginning is found in all Nikāyas with an interesting exception in the *Itivuttaka* (§ 93).

54. The end of a Suttanta is formalized as well, though not as strictly as the opening: “thus spoke the Buddha (or a monk such as *Sāriputta* etc.). Delighted, the monks (or the person addressed) approved to what the Buddha had said”. This formula occurs 16 times in DN and

<sup>100</sup> Cf. § 41 note 78. – On the structure of DN and the *Dirghāgama*: Hartmann 1994.

<sup>101</sup> The Skt. is slightly different: *evaṃ mayā śrūtam. ekasmiṃ samaye bhagavān ... viharati sma ...* On the beginning of Vinaya texts: § 33.

<sup>102</sup> This is the *nidāna* and the *puggala*, Vin II 287,21.

<sup>103</sup> For references see v. Hinüber 1989: 23 note 48, further: Samtani 1964/1965; Gallo-way 1991, Vetter, WZKS 37.1993,65 note 48, and on the symbol *evaṃ*: Kölver 1992. It is not possible to benefit from Hoffmann 1992.

about 100 times in MN, while SN and AN are quite different. Other concluding formulas cannot be discussed here. Still, it should be noted that sometimes the title of a Suttanta is given, e.g., as Brahmajāla or Ambaṭṭha, never as Brahmajāla-sutta etc., and that these discourses are called *veyyākaraṇa* “explanation”, and again not Suttanta<sup>104</sup>.

Quite unique is the end of the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta, which is an unusual text in many ways (§ 60): *evaṃ etaṃ bhūtapubban ti*, DN II 167,21 “thus it was in former times”, which is followed by verses (cf. § 236).

The end of the Suttanta has hardly found much attention so far, the only exception being Manné 1990, who for the first time has classified the texts of the Nikāyas under the following headings: 1. sermons, 2. debates, 3. consultations. Following Manné, the ending “thus spoke the Buddha...” is typical for sermons, while debates tend to end in the *saraṇagamana*-formula, by which the convinced interlocutor converts to Buddhism.

55. The middle part of the Suttantas is usually a highly formalized dialogue, though it aims at preserving the actual situation in which the Suttantas were spoken. In contrast to a modern author, however, who might imitate an actual conversation in creating a “fictitious orality”, the true orality found in early Buddhist texts avoids the natural ways of conversation, a situation that is the result of their having to create a formalized text that can be remembered and handed down by the tradition. In this respect the remembered and originally true orality of the Buddhists is ultimately much more artificial than the fictitious orality in a modern novel. This “remembered orality” results in the formulas, which again have been investigated by Manné<sup>105</sup> (cf. also § 142).

56. More than half of the dialogues in DN are debates<sup>106</sup> with Brahmins or with members of other sects roughly contemporaneous with early Buddhism, and consequently contain much, sometimes nearly the only surviving, information on these sects<sup>107</sup>. Debates of this kind

<sup>104</sup> For details: v. Hinüber 1994a: 125.

<sup>105</sup> Manné 1992 and 1993, who also draws attention to a possible gap in a Pāli text, Manné 1990: 82, cf. Oldenberg 1912b: 131 = 1967: 1045 note 1, cf. v. Hinüber 1990: 129 note 2.

<sup>106</sup> Manné 1990: 75.

<sup>107</sup> Basham 1951; MacQueen 1984.

were popular in ancient India long before Buddhism and are well known from Vedic literature, though the Buddhists have developed and perfected them<sup>108</sup>.

57. Debates are concentrated at the beginning of DN; all 13 Suttantas of the *Silakkhandhavagga* belong to this category. Here it is interesting to note that DN no. 2 *Sāmaññaphala*<sup>109</sup> consists of two parts, the second part being repeated no less than four times in four Suttantas in debates with four different persons and at four different locations (cf. § 64): DN no. 6. *Mahāli-suttanta*: Vesālī; no. 7. *Jāliya-suttanta*: Kosambi, no. 10. *Subha-suttanta*: Sāvattthi, no. 12. *Lohicca-suttanta*: Kosala. This raises the question of why a certain place name occurs in a certain Suttanta. One might try to find an answer starting from the mythological Suttanta DN no. 21 *Sakka-pañha* (§ 61), in which the Buddha answers the questions of the god Sakka/Indra in a cave called *Indasālā*. The location of this cave is described very exactly. This points to a local tradition preserved in place names. Perhaps they are not really meant originally to point to the place where a certain discourse was given, but rather to the place where a text was handed down. If this is true, it makes sense to have four different local traditions preserved in these four DN Suttantas and incorporated into the DN as a supra-regional collection to win the approval of the respective Buddhist communities. A similar idea has been put forward long ago by F.L. Woodward (1871–1952), who has observed that Sāvattthi is mentioned in no less than 736 Suttantas of the SN, which according to Woodward might have been compiled there<sup>110</sup>. Since statistics even for the Theravāda canon are non-existing, let alone for Buddhist Sanskrit texts, this area requires further investigation.

It is further interesting that in contrast to the regularly mentioned place name, no time is given at which the Suttantas were spoken. Only the commentaries invent some sort of chronology<sup>111</sup>.

58. Another question which cannot be answered at present concerns the idea behind the collections preserved in the Nikāyas. Moreover,

<sup>108</sup> Oldenberg 1917: 40 = 1993: 1788 note 1 points out that the model for the *Sāmaññaphalasuttanta* is *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* IV, 1. – Occasionally Buddhist debates texts may shed some light on corresponding Vedic texts: Witzel 1987, cf. Insler 1989/90.

<sup>109</sup> On this text Meisig 1987.

<sup>110</sup> SN-trsl. V (1930), p. XVIII, cf. § 75.

<sup>111</sup> Thomas 1949: 97 note 1, cf. Mp II 124,16–125,15

there seems to be hardly any information in ancient texts about the actual use made of them. Occasionally, recitations are mentioned in the Mahāvamsa<sup>112</sup>.

For the Vinaya the answer is easy: Rules were needed to run the Buddhist Saṃgha. The Nikāyas, on the other hand, may be some kind of compendium of the teaching, to learn about and to defend the Buddhist position, as it is said in the SN: “if, monks, other ascetics should ask you ... then you should answer”, SN IV 138,5–9. Further, as Manné has pointed out, the debates in the DN seem to have been used also to win followers: These texts are directed outwardly towards the non-Buddhists. It is, however, not unlikely that the content of DN was outdated soon, once the heretics had been defeated and Buddhism had established itself. Then first of all the form of the debates may have served as a kind of model for discussions. The texts in MN, on the other hand, aiming at the instruction of monks may have had a more lasting value (§ 68)<sup>113</sup>.

59. While the first Vagga of DN is characterized by debates, the second Vagga contains texts relating to the legend of the life of the Buddha. In DN no. 14. Mahāpadānasuttanta, the lives of the six predecessors of the historical Buddha are described<sup>114</sup>. The life story of the sixth, Vipassin, is related at length and serves as the model for the later Buddha legend.

DN no. 15. Mahānidānasuttanta discusses important points of the Dhamma such as the *paṭīcasamuppāda*.

60. The most prominent text DN no. 16. Mahāparinibbānasuttanta “the great text on the Nibbāna” forms a unit with DN no. 17. Mahāsu-dassanasuttanta, which relates the legend of Kusinārā, the place where the Buddha died. Taken together, both texts comprise about 120 printed pages. If Suttanta collections such as Itivuttaka or Udāna are compared, this could easily be a separate unit in the Tipiṭaka. According to Frauwallner, its original place would have been at the end of the Vinaya (§ 32)<sup>115</sup>.

<sup>112</sup> For references see Cūlavamsa, trsl. W.Geiger II 1930: 317sq. (index), cf. the preaching of the Brahmajālasuttanta recorded in Taw Sein-Ko 1893: 7 and Sp 788,26–790,9 on *bahussuta*: v. Hinüber 1989: 68–70.

<sup>113</sup> Manné 1990: 71, 78 sq.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Gombrich 1986/92, cf. Norman, Th-trsl ad Th 1240.

<sup>115</sup> Frauwallner 1956: 45sq. partly following Finot 1932.



The account on the last wandering of the Buddha, his food poisoning, finally his death at Kusinārā, and the distribution of the relics, is indeed the first really long literary composition extant in ancient India. Although Brāhmaṇas as such are of course much longer, they are compiled from small, separate and independent pieces, while the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta is built according to a uniform plan. The structure of this text, which has never really been investigated<sup>116</sup>, shows how the redactor(s) had to struggle with such an unusually long text. (Time and again they are at the point of losing their thread, e.g., when the Buddha explains the eight reasons for an earth quake to Ānanda, which makes good sense in the context, other groups of eight from the Aṅguttaranikāya follow suit, which have no relation at all to the context (DN II 107,19–112,20)). This at the same time shows how pieces of texts known by heart may intrude into almost any context once there is a corresponding key word. This “uncontrolled orality” created those small sections, called “Sondertexte” by P.Hacker, which are embedded in larger texts.

61. A very unusual text is DN no. 21 Sakkapañhasuttanta “the text on Sakka’s questions”. Before he himself dares to see Buddha at the Indasālā cave, the god Sakka sends the *gandhabba* (Skt. *gandharva*) Pañcasikha to please the Buddha with a song, which is indeed a love song<sup>117</sup>. Here a very rare literary genre has been preserved in a most peculiar context.

62. Much attention has been paid to DN no. 27. Aggaññasuttanta in the Pāṭikavagga, because it contains important information on the caste system and on cosmology<sup>118</sup>.

The last four Suttantas are different from all others in DN in one respect or the other. No. 30 Lakkhaṇasuttanta “text on the marks (of a *mahāpurisa* “great man”)” contains verses in various complicated metres, hardly known otherwise<sup>119</sup>.

No. 31. Siṅgālovādasuttanta “text on the instruction of Siṅgāla” treats the ethics for laymen and is called *gihivinaya* “Vinaya for the house-holders”. The instruction is given in the form of questions and answers, and may have been some kind of manual for teaching lay-

<sup>116</sup> For the time being cf. Bareau 1979 and Waldschmidt 1950/51.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Lawergen 1994: 232sq.

<sup>118</sup> v.Simson 1988; Collins 1993 with a rich bibliography.

<sup>119</sup> Norman 1993a.

men<sup>120</sup>. It is one of the canonical texts that has gained some importance in “Buddhist modernism”<sup>121</sup>.

No. 32. *Āṭāṇāṭṭiyasuttanta* is not really a Suttanta, but a *rakkhā* “protection (text)”, DN III 206,17. It also belongs to a collection of 22 texts called *Paritta* “protection” (cf. § 87).

The last two Suttantas, no. 33. *Saṅgīti-* and no. 34 *Dasuttarasuttanta* (cf. § 131), are arranged according to the number of items treated, a principle well known from the *Āṅguttaranikāya* (§ 76 sq.). Both texts are spoken by *Sāriputta*. At the beginning of no. 33, the “recitation text”, it is stated that the *Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta* has died without properly instructing his community. To avoid a similar confusion among the Buddhists and a discussion about what their founder had actually taught, *Sāriputta* suggests a joint recitation of the Dhamma in the presence of the Buddha, who approves what has been recited. This strongly recalls the last but one chapter in the *Khandhaka* of the *Vinaya*, the account of the first council (§ 8, 38).

It seems that the last two parts are secondary additions to the collection of long texts. One might even conjecture that the original length of DN was three times ten Suttantas or three decades, just as that of the *Khandhaka* in the *Vinaya* was twenty chapters or two decades (§ 37).

## II.2.2 The Majjhimanikāya

**Majjhimanikāya** (MN: 2.2): Edition: V.Trenckner I (1888); R. Chalmers II (1896), III (1899); translations: I.B.Horner: Middle Length Sayings. London I (1954), II (1957), III (1959); D.W.Evans: The Discourses of Gotama Buddha. Middle Collection. London 1992; The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha. A New Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya. Original Translation by Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, Translation Edited and Revised by Bhikkhu Bodhi. Boston and Kandy 1995. — R.O.Franke: Konkordanz der Gāthās des Majjhimanikāya. 1912 = Franke 1978: 866–916; Thich Minh Chau: The Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Pāli Majjhimanikāya. A Comparative Study. Delhi 1964.

Commentaries: *Papañcasūdanī* (§ 226–244), *Linatthappakāsinī* (§ 358).

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Barua 1967/1968 and Upās § 386.

<sup>121</sup> Bechert 1966/1988: 13sq.

63. The MN as a whole is longer than DN<sup>122</sup>, but the individual Suttantas, altogether 152, are shorter. The text is divided into three times fifty Suttantas:

1. Mahā-pañṇāsa “great (division) of fifty (texts)”: nos. 1–50
2. Majjhima-pañṇāsa “middle (division) of fifty (texts)”: nos. 51–100
3. Upari-pañṇāsa “further (division) of fifty (texts)”: nos. 101–152

Each group of fifty is subdivided into groups of ten texts. Sometimes Suttantas are grouped together in pairs called Cūḷa- and Mahā- “small” and “great” text<sup>123</sup>.

64. As in DN (§ 57), there is a text in the MN that has been repeated four times: nos. 131–134: Bhaddekaratta-suttanta: Sāvatthi; Ānanda-bhaddekaratta-suttanta: Sāvatthi; Mahākaccāna-bhaddekaratta-suttanta: Rājagaha; Lomasakaṅgiya-bhaddekaratta-suttanta: Kapilavasthu. The first text is delivered by the Buddha himself in a way perhaps unique in the Tipiṭaka. At the beginning four verses are recited and then explained: This is called *uddesa* “outline” followed by *vibhaṅga* “commentary”, MN III 187,18, a literary form that is used frequently in later times (§ 138). The second Suttanta is recited by Ānanda with the Buddha approving, and in the third Suttanta the Buddha recites only the verses and has them explained by Mahākassapa, who is the monk to know in full what the Buddha only hints at. The Suttanta extolls the fame of the Bhaddekaratta, when a god, who has heard about this text even in the Tāvattīmsa heaven, asks Lomasakaṅgiya about it.

65. Some texts of MN seem to be younger than those in DN, when it is stated that the dialogue has taken place after the Nibbāna, such as MN no. 84. Madhurasuttanta or no. 94 Ghoṭamukhasuttanta, where the legend about the foundation of the Ghoṭamukhī hall in Pāṭaliputta is related in an appendix<sup>124</sup>. Quite some time seems to have elapsed after the Nibbāna in no. 124. Bakkulasuttanta, because Bakkula, who is considered to be the healthiest of all monks, AN I 25,6, enters Nibbāna 80 years after becoming a member of the Saṃgha<sup>125</sup>. It seems

<sup>122</sup> DN has 64, but MN 80 *bhāṇavāras*: § 12 note 30.

<sup>123</sup> Horner 1953/1980.

<sup>124</sup> On the foundation of Pāṭaliputta: v. Hinüber 1989: 53sq.

<sup>125</sup> v. Hinüber 1996.

that he must have survived the Buddha by half a century, something that has caught the attention of the commentator, who states that this Suttanta has been recited only during the second council that is a hundred years after the Nibbāna (Ps IV 197,2). This remark is quite interesting for the history of the Theravāda canon, for it shows that even the tradition admitted later additions (cf. § 236).

66. Other texts come at times very near to some sort of personal memory. MN no. 140. Dhātuvibhaṅgasuttanta tells of the novice Pukku-sāti, who meets the Buddha by chance without knowing him, because he received his *pabbajjā* from some other monk. Only after being taught by the Buddha he does recognize him and asks for the *upasam-padā*, but dies before bowl and robe are at hand. Still the Buddha declares that Pukkusāti will enter Nibbāna even without ever having become a fully ordained monk.

In MN no. 144 Channovādasuttanta the seriously ill monk Channa tries to commit suicide, but Sāriputta and Mahācunda prevent him from doing so. The Buddha, however, does not object to the suicide as only the craving for rebirth should be reprehended.

~~Most interesting are those Suttantas relating personal memories of the Buddha himself, such as MN no. 26. Ariyapariyesanasuttanta, where the Buddha talks about his teachers Ājāra Kālāma and Uddaka Rāmaputta<sup>126</sup>, or when the former fellow student (*purāṇasabrahmacārī*, AN I 277,9, cf. Mp II 375, 3sq.) of the Buddha, Bharanḍuka Kālāma, is mentioned in the Tikanipāta of AN. Further, MN no. 36. Mahāsaccakasuttanta contains the famous episode of the Bodhisatta meditating as a child under a Jambu tree<sup>127</sup>.~~

~~All these are elements for a Buddha "biography", to which MN no. 123. Acchariyabbhutadhammasuttanta, must be added<sup>128</sup>.~~

67. Occasionally MN contains also Vinaya material, such as MN no. 104. Sāmagāmasuttanta, which refers to Cullavagga IV. Samathakkhandhaka; MN no. 82. Raṭṭhapālasuttanta, has been mentioned already (§ 23, cf. also § 74, 80).

68. The content of MN shows a much greater variety of topics than does DN. Only the great debates are absent in MN, though discussions

<sup>126</sup> Skilling 1981/2.

<sup>127</sup> Schlingloff 1987.

<sup>128</sup> v. Hinüber 1994a: 130.

with heretics do occur, e.g., in MN no. 56 Upālisuttanta<sup>129</sup>, or no. 57. Kukkuravatikasuttanta, where strange ascetic practices are described. It has never been really investigated in detail, though, which additional information can be found in MN, and how exactly both Nikāyas relate to each other. This, however, is also of prime importance for finding out which purpose the respective texts may have been intended to serve. As stated already, it has been surmised by Manné (§ 58) that MN might have been used to instruct converts to Buddhism, as suggested already much earlier by Franke in 1915<sup>130</sup>.

### II.2.3 The Saṃyuttanikāya

**Saṃyuttanikāya (SN: 2.3):** Edition: L.Feer I (1884), II (1888), III (1890), IV (1894), V (1898); translations: C.A.F.Rhys Davids I (1917), II (1922), and F.L. Woodward III (1925), IV (1927), V (1930): Kindred Sayings; W.Geiger: Saṃyuttanikāya: Die in Gruppen geordnete Sammlung I (1930), II (1925) [up to SN II 225], repr. with additions by Nyānapoṇika. Wolfenbüttel 1990 [up to SN III 279].

Commentaries: Sāratthappakāsinī (§ 226–244), Līnatthappakāsinī (§ 358).

69. The SN is divided into five Vaggas, which again are subdivided into Saṃyuttas. The first Vagga is named after its literary form, the rest according to the contents of the respective first Saṃyutta:

1. Sagāthavagga “division containing verses”
2. Nidānavagga “division (explaining) the Nidāna(*paṭiccasamuppāda*)”
3. Khandhavagga “division (explaining) the five *khandhas*”
4. Saḷāyatanavagga “division (explaining) the six sense organs with their objects”
5. Mahāvagga “great division”

The number of Saṃyuttas found in a Vagga is about ten. The Saṃyuttas are again subdivided as, e.g., the Khandhasaṃyutta of the Khandhavagga, into a Mūla-, Majjhima- and Uparipaññāsa “basic, middle and further (division) of fifty” containing each fifty Suttantas

<sup>129</sup> Cf. v. Hinüber 1982a and Norman 1993b.

<sup>130</sup> Franke 1978: 1102.

grouped together in five Vaggas with ten Suttantas. A survey of the at times a bit confusing divisions and subdivisions is found at SN V 497–505.

70. It is also not easy to get a clear picture of the full text of SN, which is almost twice as long as that of DN with 100 against 64 *bhāṇa-vāras* (§ 12 note 29). Consequently the manuscripts tend to abbreviate Vaggas 2–5 considerably, though not in a uniform way. According to SN V, p. VI, the Sinhalese and the Burmese manuscripts of SN almost look like copies of two different texts. It would be worth while to check this information against the evidence of old manuscripts.

Equally obscure is the number of Suttantas in SN: according to the tradition there should be 7762 (§ 48), but only 2889 have been counted in E<sup>e</sup>. The reason for this uncertainty is that the manuscripts often simply have key words to be expanded into complete Suttantas without clear instructions on how to do this<sup>131</sup>.

Consequently, this type of manuscript tradition is completely different from the one found in the first two Nikāyas, where the text is given in full, and only passages repeated verbally have been omitted at times. SN, on the other hand, can be shrunk into a skeleton to be expanded again starting from the key words<sup>132</sup>.

As L. Feer (1830–1902) has constituted a kind of average text from his manuscripts<sup>133</sup>, he may have created a kind of phantom text, a really new recension similar to the one read in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. This must be kept in mind when comparing SN II–V as printed in E<sup>e</sup> to Skt. parallels<sup>134</sup>.

71. The greater Vaggas are arranged in a systematic way. The Nidāna-vagga (SN II) contains the *paṭṭicasamuppāda* followed by the Khan-

<sup>131</sup> It is remarkable that the older term *veyyākaraṇa*, SN III 217, note 1; 278,15 is still used side by side with the more recent *suttanta*, SN III 249,18 in these instructions. – An example for a parallel text differently expanded is Vin III 70,19–71,15: SN V 321,21–322,9.

<sup>132</sup> Similarly the *mātikā* of the Kathāvatthu is expanded by Moggaliputtatissa: § 144, cf. § 237; on the expansion of a Vinaya text (Vin I 132,17): Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 101; 104 with note 161. On skeleton texts in the Jaina tradition: Alsdorf 1928: 27, cf. Frauwallner 1956: 173.

<sup>133</sup> SN V, p. VII line 3: “I have combined the two systems as well as I could”.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. the difficulties incurred by Schopen 1991: 328sq. when interpreting SN V 161,14–163,23 on the death of Sāriputta.

dhavagga (SN III) discussing the *khandhas* etc. This is the first attempt in the Tipiṭaka that tries to give a systematization of the teaching<sup>135</sup>. Perhaps this is the reason behind the name of the Nikāya “(Suttantas) grouped together”, because texts of similar content were assembled and arranged side by side.

This then is as different from DN and MN as the form of the SN texts. For in SN the teaching of the Buddha is no longer necessarily embedded in a story. The intention to present the preaching of every text as a unique event is completely missing in SN. Although the formula for the beginning is also used in the mostly very short Suttantas in SN, though rarely also the one for the end, in between there are often only enumerations of dogmatic concepts.

72. Nevertheless, occasionally SN has texts which might well fit into MN, as does the Cittasamyutta, SN IV 281,11–304,26 (cf. Vin II 15,29–20,35), which relates different events in the life of the householder Citta, who was a layfollower of the Buddha for 30 years. It is noteworthy that Isidatta, while instructing Citta, refers to and actually quotes from DN: *brahmajāle bhaṇitāni*, SN IV 287,13. Quotations of this kind seem to occur only in SN and AN<sup>136</sup>.

More complicated is the relation of the Satipaṭṭhānasamyutta, SN V 141–192 to the Satipaṭṭhānasuttantas found in DN no. 22. Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasuttanta and MN no. 10 Satipaṭṭhānasuttanta<sup>137</sup>, which deserves a detailed study, because it seems that sometimes SN has preserved smaller parts from which larger units were built, or pieces of texts, which for some reason or other were not incorporated into the larger Suttantas.

73. Some parts of SN contain passages hardly related to Buddhism such as Mātugāmasamyutta, SN IV 246,2–250,28 “(texts) on women grouped together” in the Saḷāyatanavagga, for this is some kind of *strīdharma* “behaviour of women” rather. The Nāgasamyutta, SN III 240,16–246,6 “(texts) on Nāgas grouped together” in the Khandhavagga is important for an aspect of ancient Indian religion about which not much is known<sup>138</sup>.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Bronkhorst 1985: 316.

<sup>136</sup> On quotations in the Tipiṭaka: v. Hinüber 1994a: 126, § 80 note 145.

<sup>137</sup> The last two texts have been discussed by Schmithausen 1976.

<sup>138</sup> Nāgas appear either as a snake or as a human being: Vin I 86,36–88,3; on the Nāga cult: Härtel 1993: 425–427.

74. The first part of SN, the Sagāthavagga, is completely different from the Vaggas described so far, but rather similar in some respects to the Suttanipāṭa (§ 96, cf. also § 92). The most important part of this text are the verses. These sometimes occur also in other parts of the Tipiṭaka: The verses of the Vaṅṭīsasamyutta, SN I 185,3–196,27 are attributed to this very monk in Th 1209–1262 (§ 105) etc.

Parts of the Sagāthavagga seem to be very old, actually very near to Vedic texts<sup>139</sup>, as in the section in which Sakka fights the Asuras in the Sakkasamyutta, SN I 216,4–240,14. One contest is of particular interest, when Sakka and the king of Asuras, Vepacitti, fight each other with well formulated verses (*subhāsita*), SN I 222,21–224,14 in the presence of referees (*pārisajja*).

The most prominent part of the Sagāthavagga is the Dhajaggasutta, which contains the *iti pi so*-formula. This text, which lay people know by heart even today, may be considered as some sort of Buddhist creed<sup>140</sup>.

The Brahmasamyutta, SN I 136,4–159,6, begins with an account of the enlightenment, which runs parallel to the beginning of the Mahāvagga in the Vinaya. And the Vaṅṭīsasamyutta, SN I 190,21–191,24, contains an archaic text on the *pavāraṇā*, explained in Mahāvagga IV Pavāraṇakkhandhaka, Vin I 159,22–160,2<sup>141</sup>.

The form of texts as found in the Sagāthavagga has been developed in the Jātaka (cf. § 113).

75. It is impossible to determine, why a collection of texts so different as the Sagāthavagga on one hand and the remaining parts of SN on the other have been combined (cf. § 230).

It has been observed that many Suttantas of SN are located in Sāvattthi. Therefore, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1857–1942) and F.L. Woodward have suggested that this collection may have been brought together at this place (cf. § 57 note 110; § 93).

## II.2.4 The Aṅguttaranikāya

**Aṅguttaranikāya (AN: 2.4):** Editions: R. Morris I (1883, <sup>2</sup>1885), revised by A.K. Warder (1961), II (1888), E. Hardy III (1897), IV (1899) [rev.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. Lanman 1893 on SN I 51,2–23\*.

<sup>140</sup> Bechert 1988; cf. also Bizot/v. Hinüber 1994.

<sup>141</sup> Frauwallner 1956: 133, cf. § 67, 80.



AN III, IV: E.Leumann, GGA 161.1891, 585–602], V (1900); translations: F.L.Woodward: The Book of Gradual Sayings I (1932), II (1933), V (1936), E.M.Hare III (1934), IV (1935); Nyanatiloka [Anton Güth]: Die Lehrreden des Buches aus der angereichten Sammlung. Köln <sup>3</sup>1969 Band I–V [rev.: Bechert, ZDMG 121.1971, 407sq.].

Commentaries: Manorathapūraṇī (§ 226–244); Sāratthamañjūsā (§ 375sq.).

76. The AN is arranged according to a numerical system beginning with sets of one and ending with those of eleven items or persons.

The name *Aṅguttara* is difficult to explain grammatically, though generally understood as “one member more, in addition”, which is a translation *ad sensum* justified by the tradition: *ekaekaṅgātirekava-sena*, Sp 27,16 “always one member more”. It is used side by side with *Ekuttara*, cf. CPD s.v. (§ 47), which means “one more”. The corresponding translation, however, does not apply for DN no. 34 *Dasuttara* “the highest (number of which) is ten” (§ 62), although this word may have been the model for the formation of the word *Aṅguttara*(?).

The word *aṅga* itself only rarely designates items in AN. The first instance is *tīhi aṅgehi pāpaṇiko*, AN I 115,15. Much more frequently *dhamma* is used: *ekadhammaṃ*, AN I 3,2 etc.

77. The subdivisions are designated by *nipāta*, which is used in this way only in Buddhist texts<sup>142</sup>, thus: *Ekanipāta* etc. “chapter containing of the ones”.

Strictly speaking the numerical arrangement works only from *Eka-* to *Pañcakanipāta*, because the number necessary for the chapters on six etc. is sometimes reached only by adding up groups of 3+3 or 5+4, or even 3+3+3+2 items in the *Ekādasakanipāta*<sup>143</sup>.

The exact structure of AN is difficult to determine. Again the traditional number of Suttantas is 9557 against 2344 actually counted (§ 48). As there are some old manuscripts of the 16th century, which sometimes have a text worded slightly differently from the printed

<sup>142</sup> On *nipāta* cf. J.C.Wright, BSOAS 58.1995, 221. — Buddhist Skt. texts show that *nipāta* is interchangeable with *vagga*: *vistareṇa velāmasūtre madhyamāgame brāhmaṇanipāte*, GM III 1,98,15, which should correspond to the *Brahmaṇavagga* in the *Majjhima-papañāsa* of MN, where, however, no Suttanta of this title is found.

<sup>143</sup> The relevant material is collected at AN V 421 sq. appendix IV.

editions, e.g., in the introductory formulas, it would be useful to check the structure of AN against this evidence.

Originally, it seems, AN had only ten Nipātas<sup>144</sup>. This can be deduced from the fact that at the end of the Dasakanipāta not only groups of 10 items occur as the title implies, but also groups of 20 (AN V 304), 30 (AN V 305), and 40 (AN V 306) items, which is typical for the last chapter of a text (cf. § 114 on the Jātaka). Thus the structure of AN would repeat the one of DN no. 34 Dasuttarasuttanta (§ 62) on a large scale.

78. Structuring texts on numerical principles was a wide spread practice in ancient India: The third Aṅga of the Jaina canon Tṛhāṇṅga/Stānaṅga is arranged as AN, from one to ten, and the fourth Aṅga Samavāyaṅga, from one to one million. Similar structures are found in the Mahābhārata, such as the Viduraṇṭivākya in the Udyogaparvan, Mhbh 5,2,33.

79. Among the items treated in the Ekakanipāta there are prominent persons, 42 monks, AN I 23,16–25,16, 13 nuns, AN I 25,17–31 among them no. 5 Dhammadinnā, AN I 25,22, as the foremost among the *dhammakathikās* “preachers”, who has spoken MN no. 44 Cūḷavedallasuttanta, a rare instance of a text preached by a woman. At the end, ten men and ten women are enumerated, who are prominent among the layfollowers, AN I 25,32–26,27, among them Khujjuttarā, who had heard the Itivuttaka from the Buddha (§ 93). The commentary gives long stories on all these persons (§ 235).

80. Some passages of AN have found their way into other parts of the Tipiṭaka such as the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta (§ 60). As SN (§ 74 note 141) and MN (§ 67), AN, too, contains sometimes rather old Vinaya passages in, e.g., the classification of *āpatti* “offence”, AN I 88,1–10. Here and in similar paragraphs sometimes old material may be preserved from which the Vinayapiṭaka has been built. In other cases the source of an AN paragraph may have been the Vinaya, such as the account of the foundation of the order of nuns, which is also told in the Aṭṭhakavagga, AN IV 274–279 = Vin II 253–256, because of the eight *garudhamma* “strict rules” for the nuns (§ 31). All these parallels and cross references<sup>145</sup> deserve detailed investigation<sup>146</sup>.

<sup>144</sup> Norman 1983: 56 refers to the parallel text of other Buddhist schools.

<sup>145</sup> Quotations in and from AN are collected in the CPD s.v. AN; on SN cf. § 72 note 136.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Gombrich 1987.

81. Interesting is the lament of Pasenadi, the king of Kosala, about the death of his queen Mallikā and his consolation by the Buddha, AN III 57,1–19, for this reads as if preserved only to commemorate that queen. It is followed by a story of considerable interest for cultural history. After the death of his queen Bhaddā, king Muṇḍa refuses to eat or to have a bath, and tries to preserve the corpse of his queen in oil, AN III 57–62. Only after being instructed by the Buddha about the vanity of his plan does he have her cremated and even builds a stūpa for her, AN III 62,27.

Further, the four kinds of poets enumerated at AN II 230,11–13 (Mp III 211,9–13) could be mentioned here<sup>147</sup>.

82. On the other hand, it is also worthwhile to point out important items of the *dhmma* not mentioned in AN, such as the four *pubbani-mittāni*, the four truths etc.<sup>148</sup>. The *paṭiccasamuppāda* with its twelve members is missing, as it would not fit into a numerical structure ending with eleven.

83. Structurally, the four Nikāyas can be divided into two groups. The collections of long texts in DN and MN without any recognizable order are quite different from SN and AN, where a more systematic approach in arranging the comparatively brief texts seems to have been envisaged. Further, the last two Nikāyas seem to be much more open for enlargement, because it is rather easy to insert texts which fit either according to their content into SN or according to the number of items into AN.

However, too many questions have to be investigated yet for conclusions about the structure of the four Nikāyas, as e.g., the direction of movement of texts perhaps starting from the short Suttantas, which could be absorbed into the long ones. Further, a comparison with the canon of the Jainas might show that the long Suttantas in DN and MN are structurally much more typical Buddhist than the shorter texts in SN and AN. And lastly, it should be kept in mind that originally the texts may have been arranged quite differently as long as the division into *aṅgas* was still valid (§ 10).

### II.2.5 The Khuddakanikāya

84. The “group of small texts” consists of fifteen very heterogeneous works of widely varying length, the shortest being the Khuddakapāṭha

<sup>147</sup> v. Hinüber 1994b: 35; CPD s.v. *kabba* and § 107.

<sup>148</sup> Norman 1983: 55.

with less than nine printed pages, in contrast to the Niddesa with over 500 pages. Only three collections contain Suttantas similar to those in the first four Nikāyas, nine are collections of verses, one is a commentary, one a philosophical text, and the Khuddakapāṭha has been assembled from short pieces found elsewhere in the canon.

The actual number of texts found in this Nikāya is not uniform in the Theravāda countries, for in Burma Suttasaṅgha, Nettippakaraṇa, Peṭakopadesa, and Milindapañha have also been added to this Nikāya (§ 156).

85. The long history of the uncertainty about the contents of this Nikāya has been described by Lamotte 1956a<sup>149</sup>. This uncertainty prevails also in Theravāda, the only school to possess a complete Khuddakanikāya. The earliest lists of the texts contained in this Nikāya are found in the description of the canon at the beginning of the commentaries on the Vinaya-, Sutta-, and Abhidhammapiṭaka respectively (§ 212). While the Vinaya commentary knows fifteen texts: *pannara-sabheda*, Sp 18,12–15, the Abhidhamma commentary also has *cudda-sappabheda*, As 26,3 “having fourteen divisions”, without elaborating on this: probably the Khp is missing.

The most important discussion of the contents of this Nikāya, however, is found in the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, the commentary on DN, because it is said here that the Dīgha- and Majjhima-bhāṇakas adhere to a tradition, in which the texts have been recited in a sequence different from the one finally accepted in Theravāda, Sv 15,21–29 (cf. § 316 note 505). Consequently there are two lists:

#### I. Standard sequence:

1. Khuddakapāṭha
2. Dhammapada
3. Udāna
4. Itivuttaka
5. Suttanipāta
6. Vimānavatthu
7. Petavatthu
8. Theragāthā
9. Therīgāthā

#### II. Sequence of DN/MN-bhāṇaka

1. Jātaka
2. Niddesa
3. Paṭisambhidāmagga
4. Suttanipāta
5. Dhammapada
6. Udāna [beginning of Paramatthadīpanī]
7. Itivuttaka
8. Vimānavatthu
9. Petavatthu

<sup>149</sup> Summarized in Lamotte 1958/1988: 174/158sq.; important remarks in Bechert 1958: 16 sq. note 47.

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| I. Standard sequence: | II. Sequence of DN/MN-bhāṇaka              |
| 10. Jātaka            | 10. Theragāthā                             |
| 11. Niddesa           | 11. Therīgāthā [end of DN-bhāṇaka list]    |
| 12. Paṭisambhidāmagga | 12. Cariyāpiṭaka [end of Paramatthadīpanī] |
| 13. Apadāna           | 13. Apadāna                                |
| 14. Buddhavaṃsa       | 14. Buddhavaṃsa                            |
| 15. Cariyāpiṭaka      |  |

The Khp is not accepted by either DN- nor MN-bhāṇakas. Both call the Khuddakanikāya Khuddakagantha, Sv 15,15.29, but while the DN-bhāṇakas include it in the Abhidhamma-, the MN-bhāṇakas have it in the Suttaṭṭaka.

It is important to note that the sequence of the DN/MN-bhāṇaka, no. 6. Ud to no. 12 Cp is the one of Dhammapāla's Paramatthadīpanī I–VII (§ 273).

A still different subdivision seems to be found in the commentary on the Aṅguttaranikāya when the disappearance of the Sāsana is described, Mp I 88, 3–89,16<sup>150</sup>. First, the end of the Abhidhammapiṭaka is lost, and then the canon is described here as disappearing in the reverse order. There is no trace of the Khuddakanikāya, because after the Abhidhamma AN – SN – MN – DN disappear, then only Jātaka and Vinaya are available at a certain stage, which leaves the affiliation of Ja open. There are still other relevant, partly difficult, passages in the commentaries, which will be discussed elsewhere.

There does not seem to be any recognizable system in the arrangement of these texts in the Khuddakanikāya with the exception perhaps of the last three, which roughly may be called “hagiographical”.

### II.2.5.1 The Khuddakapāṭha

**Khuddakapāṭha (Khp: 2.5.1):** Editions: H.Smith 1915 with Pj I; translation: Khuddakapāṭho. Kurze Texte. Eine kanonische Schrift des Pāli-Buddhismus übersetzt von K.Seidenstücker. Breslau 1910; The Minor Readings – The Illustrator of the Ultimate Meaning trsl. by Ñāṇamoli. London 1960.

Commentary: Paramatthajotikā I (§ 252–254).

<sup>150</sup> Cf. CPD s.v. *antaradhāna* and add Sv 898,18–899,26 ≠ Ps IV 115,10–116,26, cf. § 318 note 527.

86. The title, which translates as “Short Texts” or “Recitations”, refers to the fact that this is a collection of nine short pieces gleaned from the canon and put together most probably for practical purposes as a kind of handbook (cf. Upās 124,8–13)<sup>151</sup>:

1. Saraṇagamaṇa “taking refuge”: Vin I 22,15–20 etc.
2. Dasasikkhāpada “ten moral precepts”: Vin I 83,32–84,2 etc.
3. Dvattiṃsākāra “32 parts (of the body)”: Paṭi I 6,31–7,7
4. Kumārapañha “questions of the boy”: AN V 50,22–54,13
5. Maṅgalasutta “auspicious text”: Sn 258–269
6. Ratanasutta “jewel text”: Sn 222–238
7. Tirokuḍḍasutta “text ‘across the wall’”: Pv I 5 verses 14–25
8. Nidhikaṇḍa “paragraph on the treasure”: –
9. Mettasutta “friendship text”: Sn 143–152

Only no. 8 is without parallel in the canon; however, the verse Khp VIII 9 is quoted by Kv 351,18\*–21\* (§ 148). This seems to indicate that the Nidhikaṇḍa too is an old independent text only contained in this collection in the Tipiṭaka.

87. Nos. 1–6 and 9 are found in the same sequence again in the Paritta (Parit: 2.9.1) (§ 62), where there are two texts placed between nos. 4 and 5. In Khp on the other hand no. 7. Tirokuḍḍa and no. 8 Nidhikaṇḍa have been put between Parit nos. 8 and 9. Therefore, it can be assumed that both Khp and Parit originated by expanding a common predecessor in different directions. In contrast to Khp, the Paritta is still widely used in Theravāda countries<sup>152</sup>.

### II.2.5.2 The Dhammapada

**Dhammapada (Dhp: 2.5.2):** Edition: Dhammapada Edited by O.v. Hinüber and K.R.Norman with a Complete Word Index by S.

<sup>151</sup> The enumeration of texts recommended by Aśoka (Bairāt/Calcutta) might be the earliest reference to a similar collection; cf. § 97sq.

<sup>152</sup> The Paritta texts are enumerated in CPD I (Epil.) p. 93\*sq.; for further protective texts including 4.5.2 Jayamaṅgalagāthā and Mahāḍibbamanta (BSOAS 28.1965: 61–80) cf. the excellent survey and bibliography by Skilling 1992; the Paritta is also discussed in Schalk 1974. – Commentary: Sāratthasamuccaya (Parit-a: 2.9.1,1): Edition: C<sup>e</sup> (SHB XXV), 1929. This text, which is also called Catubhāṇavāraṭṭhaka-thā appears to be extracted from the Aṭṭhakathā on the respective texts. On the date of Parit-a cf. Upās p. 35.

and T. Tabata. Oxford 1994; <sup>2</sup>1995; translations: J.R.Carter; M.Paliha-wadana: The Dhammapada. A New English Translation with the Pāli Text and the First English Translation of the Commentary's Explanation of the Verses and with Notes from Sinhala Sources and Critical Textual Comments. Oxford 1987. – W.B.Bollée: Reverse Index of the Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, Thera- and Therīgāthā Pādas with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarañjhāya, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāim. Reinbek 1983. StII Monographien 8 [rev.: WZKS 31.1987, 201sq.].

Commentary: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (§262–269).

88. The Dhammapada is the first Pāli text ever critically edited in Europe by the Danish pioneer of Pāli studies Viggo Fausbøll (1821–1908): *Dhammapadam ex tribus codicibus Hauniensibus Palice edidit Latine vertit ...* in 1855. Many editions and still more translations have followed. Thus a Dhammapada bibliography is a desideratum (cf. Hecker 1993).

89. The Dhp, which can be translated as “Words of the Dhamma”, is a collection of 423 verses divided into 26 Vaggas. More than half of them have parallels in corresponding collections in other Buddhist schools<sup>153</sup>, frequently also in non-Buddhist texts<sup>154</sup>. The interrelation of these different versions has been obscured by constant contamination in the course of the text transmission. This is particularly true in case of one of the Buddhist Sanskrit parallels. The Udānavarga originally was a text corresponding to the Pāli Udāna (§ 91). By adding verses from the Dhp it was transformed into a Dhp parallel in course of time<sup>155</sup>, which is a rare event in the evolution of Buddhist literature (cf. § 36).

90. The contents of the Dhp are mainly gnomic verses, many of which have hardly any relation to Buddhism. Linguistically, some of the verses seem to be rather old.

As for the Jātaka verses (§ 112), stories have been invented by the commentary which illustrate the occasion on which they were spoken by the Buddha (§ 253).

<sup>153</sup> Willemsen 1974.

<sup>154</sup> Rau 1959.

<sup>155</sup> Bernhard 1969.

## II.2.5.3 The Udāna

**Udāna (Ud: 2.5.3):** Edition: P.Steinthal 1885 with important additions: E.Windisch, JPTS 1890, 91–108, and K.Seidenstücker: Das Udāna. Eine kanonische Schrift des Pāli-Buddhismus. Leipzig 1913; translations: Das Buch der feierlichen Worte des Erhabenen ... deutsche Übersetzung von K. Seidenstücker. München 1920; Udāna: Verses of Uplift. The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon II trsl. by F.L.Woodward. London 1935; Inspired Utterance of the Buddha trsl. by J.D.Ireland. Kandy 1990; The Udāna Trsl. from the Pāli by P.Masefield. Oxford 1994 [rev.: O.v. Hinüber, JAOS 115.1995 (in press)].

Commentary: Paramatthadīpanī (§277–279).

91. The Udāna “Inspired Utterances” (defined at Ud-a 2,14–19) belongs to those old texts mentioned already as one of the *navan̄gas* (§ 10). Ud has eight Vaggas with ten *udānas* each. The occasion for such an *udāna* is given in the prose introduction, which ends by “at this moment (the Buddha) made this utterance”, followed by the verse. Thus it does not seem to be impossible that there once was an Ud having only verses such as those in the Udānavarga (§ 89).

About one quarter of the prose texts have a parallel in other parts of the canon, and there seems to be some special affinity to Vinaya texts. Some concepts developed in Ud are fairly old and have parallels in both Jainism and in the Upaniṣads<sup>156</sup>.

The formula at the end of the first Vagga (Ud I 10) *ayaṃ pi udāno vutto bhagavatā iti me sutaṃ*, Ud 9,9 “this utterance too was spoken by the Buddha; thus have I heard” connects this text to the Itivuttaka (§ 93). Although this sentence is preserved only here, it may have been the conclusion of all *udānas* once. For the commentary explains it at the end of the very first section (Ud I 1), where it is no longer extant in the text, and states that it is found here only “in some books”, Ud-a 45,20.

## II.2.5.4 The Itivuttaka

**Itivuttaka (It: 2.5.4):** Edition: E.Windisch 1889; translations: Itivuttaka. Das Buch der Herrenworte übersetzt von K.Seidenstücker. Leipzig 1922; Itivuttaka: As It Was Said. The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli

<sup>156</sup> Enomoto 1989.



Canon II trsl. by F.L.Woodward. London 1935; J.D.Ireland: The Itivuttaka. The Buddha's Sayings. Kandy 1991; – J.H.Moore: Collation of the Siamese Edition of the Itivuttaka. JPTS 1906/7, 176–181; J.H.Moore: Metrical Analysis of the Pāli Itivuttaka. JAOS 28. 1907, 317–330.

Commentary: Paramatthadīpanī (§ 277–279).

92. The Itivuttaka “(Text Beginning with) ‘Thus Spoken’”<sup>157</sup> consists of 122 very short Suttantas all ending in verses. Thus It is similar to Ud, and both texts are always mentioned side by side in the list of *navāṅga* (§ 10). In contrast to Ud, prose and verses of It form a conceptual unit, which brings these Suttantas near to the *Sagāthavagga* of SN (§ 74).

The text is numerically arranged from Eka- to Catukka-nipāta, which are subdivided into Vaggas of about ten Suttantas.

93. The text got its name from the beginning of the individual Suttantas, which is different from all other texts in the Tipiṭaka (§ 53): *vuttam hetam bhagavatā vuttam arahatā ti me sutam* “this spoke the Buddha, spoke the Arahant; thus have I heard”. It has caught already the attention of the commentary that no place name is mentioned. The reason given is that all Suttantas were spoken in Kosambi and heard by the laywoman Khujjuttarā (It-a I 29, 7–33, 8; cf. § 79). If there is any truth in this tradition, which cannot be traced back beyond Dhammapāla's commentary (§ 277sq.), then It could have been collected and formalized in Kosambi in a way typical for this place, in contrast perhaps to, say, Sāvatthi, where *evam me sutam* was preferred (§ 75). This however remains highly speculative.

In the same way, as at the beginning, there is a special formula also at the end of Suttantas in It: *ayam pi attho vutto bhagavatā iti me sutam* “and this was spoken by the Buddha; thus have I heard”, which has one single parallel in Ud (§ 91).

At the end of It, from Tikanipāta, Vagga 4 onwards, the systematic formalization of Suttantas discontinues. It has been suggested that the Catukka-vagga<sup>158</sup>, which draws material from AN, is younger than the rest of this perhaps very old text<sup>159</sup>.

<sup>157</sup> On the Sanskritization of this title: v. Hinüber 1994a: 133.

<sup>158</sup> This Vagga is not found in the Chinese translation: Watanabe 1906/7.

<sup>159</sup> Winternitz 1912/1933: 71 note 1/91 note 2: “much of which can be traced back to the Buddha himself” (!).

## II.2.5.5 The Suttanipāta

**Suttanipāta (Sn: 2.5.5):** Edition: D.Andersen and H.Smith 1913; translations: Nyanaponika: *Sutta-Nipāta. Früh-buddhistische Lehr-Dichtungen aus dem Pāli Kanon mit Auszügen aus den alten Kommentaren.* Konstanz <sup>2</sup>1977; K.R.Norman: *The Group of Discourses. Vol. II Revised Translation with Introduction and Notes.* London 1992 [rev.: L.Cousins, JRS 3.4.2.1994,291 sq.]; – V.Fausbøll: *The Sutta-nipāta Part II Glossary.* London n.d.[foreword 1894]; R.O.Franke: *Die Suttanipāta-Gāthās mit ihren Parallelen.* ZDMG 63.1909; 64.1910; 65.1912 = Franke 1978: 474–777; W.B.Bollée: *The Pādas of the Suttanipāta with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajjhāya, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāim.* Reinbek 1980. StII Monographie 7; N.A. Jayawickrama: *A Critical Analysis of the Suttanipāta Illustrating Its Gradual Growth.* Thesis London 1947 [published in UCR 6.1948–9.1951].

Commentary: *Paramatthajotikā II* (§ 255–259).

94. The Suttanipāta “Groups of Discourses” (definition Pj II 1,13\*) comprises five Vaggas:

1. Uraga-vagga: 12 Suttantas “divison (beginning with the) snake (text)”
2. Cūḷa-vagga 14 Suttantas “small division”
3. Mahā-vagga: 12 Suttantas “large division”
4. Aṭṭhaka-vagga 16 Suttantas “division of eights”
5. Pārāyaṇa-vagga: 16 Suttantas “division of going to the far shore”

95. The Sn begins with a collection of verses in the *Uragasuttanta*, which could have been included also in the *Dhp*. The second text is the famous dialogue of the Buddha and the herdsman Dhaniya “the rich”, who is happy with the life of a householder, while the Buddha praises the freedom he gained by leaving his belongings behind. The person speaking a verse is indicated, e.g., by *iti Dhaniyo gopo* “thus Dhaniya the herdsman”, which according to the commentary has been introduced by the *saṅgītikāras* “those participating in the (first) council”. Similarly indications are given in the *Mahābhārata* such as *Brhadaśva uvāca* “Brhadaśva said”. This seems to be alien to the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The *Cūḷavagga*, Sn II contains the *Ratana*-, *Maṅgala*-suttanta, which have been included in *Khp*, together with the *Mettasuttanta* (Sn I 8) (§ 86).

The first two texts in the Mahāvagga, Sn III are verses referring to the biography of the Buddha, describing his *pabbajjā* “leaving home to become an ascetic” and his struggle with Māra<sup>160</sup>.

96. Other texts are true Suttanta<sup>s</sup> such as III 7 Selasuttanta, Sn 102,17–112,20 or III 9 Vāseṭṭhasuttanta, Sn 115,1–123,14, appearing in the Majjhimanikāya as well as MN nos. 92 and 98<sup>161</sup>, respectively. Further, many parallels are found in the structurally similar Sagāthavagga of SN (§ 74), such as the Vaṅṅīsasamyutta, SN I 185,3–196,22, which contains the first part of the verses ascribed to Vaṅṅīsa in the Theragāthā 1209–1279, while the second part of these verses is shared with Sn II 12 Vaṅṅīsasuttanta.

97. There are also parallels outside the Theravāda canon<sup>162</sup>, and a reference probably to a Sn-text on the Aśokan inscriptions, if the *muni-gāthā* and the *moneyasuta* mentioned on the Bairāt edict are really Sn I 12 Munisuttanta, Sn 207–221 and Sn 699–723 from Sn III 11 Nālakasuttanta, which are called *moneyyaṃ uttamam padam*, Sn 700. The identification of further titles on this inscription is still more conjectural.

The *muni-gāthā* are also mentioned in an enumeration of texts in Divyāvadāna 20,23 sq. and 35,1<sup>163</sup> together with the *arthavargīyāṇi sūtrāṇi*, which may correspond to Sn IV Aṭṭhakavagga<sup>164</sup>.

98. The last two Vaggas, Sn IV Aṭṭhakavagga and Sn V Pārāyaṇavagga, seem to be very old texts. Both are quoted in other parts of the canon<sup>165</sup>, and both include rather early concepts of the teaching<sup>166</sup>.

The fact that they are quoted in the Divyāvadāna, and that the Niddesa (§ 116) is a commentary on them, seems to indicate that both these Vaggas have enjoyed an existence as independent texts for quite some time. It seems to be a typical feature of Theravāda to include

<sup>160</sup> Important discussion in Windisch 1895: 1sq.; 245sq.

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Franke 1914 and Norman, Sn-trsl.: XXXI.

<sup>162</sup> Norman 1980.

<sup>163</sup> Cf. also GM III 4,188,8–10. <

<sup>164</sup> On the problems of this text and its title: Lévi 1915: 413sq.; Vallée Poussin 1932; Lamotte 1958/1988: 177sq./161sq.; CPD s.v.; SWTF s.v. *arthavargiya*.

<sup>165</sup> CPD s.v. Aṭṭhakavagga, and Pārāyaṇavagga e.g.: SN II 47,12; AN I 134,9; AN IV 63,13.

<sup>166</sup> Vetter 1988 and 1990: 100sq.

finally all texts in some collection or other, not tolerating separate texts as do other schools<sup>167</sup>.

In the Niddesa both these Vaggas are embedded in a commentary similar to the Pātimokkhasutta in the Vinayavibhaṅga (§ 15).

99. The Sn as a whole comprises rather variagated texts collected perhaps for similar purposes as Khp (§ 87). Another feature shared with Khp are the texts gleaned from other parts of the canon. Therefore, Sn may be considered, if one wants to speculate, some kind of earlier ritual handbook that even has some parts in common with Khp (§ 86).

### II.2.5.6,7 The Vimānavatthu and the Petavatthu

**Vimānavatthu (Vv: 2.5.6):** Edition: Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu New Edition by N.A.Jayawickrama. London 1977; translations: Vimānavatthu: Stories of the Mansions. The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon IV. New Translation of the Verses and Commentarial Excerpts by I.B.Horner. London 1974; Vimāna-vatthu. Wege zum Himmel. Ein Text aus der kürzeren Sammlung des Pālikanons ... üb. von H. Hekker. Hamburg 1994.

Commentary: Paramatthadīpanī (§ 280–282).

**Petavatthu (Pv: 2.5.6):** Edition: s. Vv; translation: Petavatthu: Stories of the Departed The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon IV. Translated by H.S.Gehman. London 1942/1974; – W.Stede: Über das Petavatthu mit einer Übersetzung der ersten zwei Bücher und einem Glossar. Thesis Leipzig 1914.

100. Vimānavatthu “(Text Having) the Heavenly Palaces as Topic” and Petavatthu “(Texts Having) the Ghosts as Topic” belong together, as witnessed by their form, contents and mediocre literary quality<sup>168</sup>. Vv is the longer one with seven Vaggas, 85 Vatthus (Vv-a 4,26sq.) and 1282 verses, while Pv has four Vaggas with 51 Vatthus (Pv-a 2,31sq.) and only 814 verses<sup>169</sup>.

<sup>167</sup> Texts outside the canon are considered apocryphal: § 437.

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Winternitz 1912: 77 “die beiden höchst unerfreulichen, glücklicherweise wenig umfangreichen Werke”: not repeated in Winternitz 1933: 98.

<sup>169</sup> The exact number of verses is not clear: CPD (Epil.) counts 1015 verses for Vv and 806 verses for Pv.

**101.** Both texts, though, are of some importance as sources for popular religion, for they deal with stories of persons who have died and either enjoy their good deeds in *vimānas* or suffer from their bad deeds as *petas*. Particularly if relatives still living do not help, by offering food etc., the ghosts are subject to hunger and other deprivations. Thus these texts, which possess a commentary giving the frame story for the verses (§ 280), are clearly addressed to laypeople.

**102.** The age of the different parts of Vv and Pv does not seem to be uniform. Some Vatthus are considered young and added only during the second council even by the tradition: Pv-a 144,20 on Pv II 10. – In three *Vimānas āryā*-verses are found<sup>170</sup>.

#### II.2.5.8,9 The Thera- and Therīgāthā

**Theragāthā (Th: 2.5.8):** Edition: The Thera- and Therīgāthā ed. by H. Oldenberg and R. Pischel. Second Edition with Appendices by K.R. Norman and L. Alsdorf. London 1966 [rev.: W.B. Bollée, IJ 11.1969, 146–149]; translation: K.R. Norman: Elders' Verses I. Thera-gāthā. London 1969 [rev.: H. Bechert, ZDMG 121.1971, 403–405]; – W. Stede: The Pādas of the Thera- and Therīgāthā. JPTS 1924/1927, 31–226.

**Therīgāthā (Thī: 2.5.9):** Edition: see Th; translation: K.R. Norman: Elders' Verses II. Therīgāthā. London 1971 [rev.: W.B. Bollée, JAOS 93.1973, 601–603; R. Gombrich, BSOAS 37.1974, 703–705].

Commentary: Paramatthadīpanī (§ 283sq.).

**103.** These collections contain verses spoken by monks and nuns. Therefore, they cannot be considered *buddhavacana*.

Both texts form a unit, and have a common commentary (§ 275, 283). The longer one is Th, comprising 1279 (or according to the tradition 1360) verses, Th-a I 3,31\*, cf. Th 115,10\*. Counting the numbers given in the *uddānas* “summaries” at the end of the Nipātas adds up to a third figure: 1294<sup>171</sup>. The reason for this confusion seems to be, in part, differing division of verses, and in part carelessness. The number of Elders who are supposed to have spoken these verses is unanimously 264 (Th-a I 3,32\* = Th 115,11\*). No figures for Thī are

<sup>170</sup> Alsdorf 1967: 80 sq.

<sup>171</sup> Norman 1983: 74.

available in the commentary. At the end of the text 494 verses and 101 nuns are counted (Thī 174, note). Again the *uddānas* have 116 nuns and 494 verses. The actual number of nuns who spoke the verses is only 73<sup>172</sup>.

104. Both collections are divided into Nipātas, arranged according to numerical principles: the first Nipāta contains single verses, the second, groups of two, etc., up to 14 then follow groups of 20 to 70, and finally the Mahānipāta, with long sequences of verses. Thus Th has 21 Nipātas and Thī 16 from 1 to 40 verses and a Mahānipāta. No systematic order can be recognized within the Nipātas. Only occasionally is there a connection by key words such as *sukha*, Th 219 sq. (cf. § 21).

105. Although Th and Thī are mostly parallel in structure and contents, there are minor differences too. While all verses of Th are clearly ascribed to a monk, some of the Thī verses are anonymous such as Thī 1, or are only connected to, but not spoken by a certain nun<sup>173</sup>. Sometimes, the verses are not even connected to a nun at all as in Thī 291–311, a dialogue between Cāpā and her husband, whom she tries to prevent from becoming a monk.

A peculiarity of Thī are the vocatives in the verses: The nun is either addressed by someone, or she addresses herself; which is the case cannot be decided.

Verses may be attributed to a certain person on account of a name (e.g., Th 365–369) or a key word (e.g., *vinayaṃ*, Th 250: Upāli) occurring in a verse. It is not known whether this is based on any real memory<sup>174</sup>. Sometimes the attribution is not uniform, for some verses are connected to different persons in Th/Thī and in the Apadāna (§ 122)<sup>175</sup>.

Quite a few verses are also attributed to the same monks in other parts of the canon (cf. § 74; 96), and there are collections of verses which could have been included into Th, such as those in the eighth chapter of the Milindapañha, but were not for some reason or other (§ 177).

<sup>172</sup> Mizuno 1993: 81.

<sup>173</sup> Thī-trsl § 2.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Th-trsl § 4; Thī-trsl § 6.

<sup>175</sup> Mizuno 1993: 61sq.

106. The sources, from which Th/Thī has been compiled are not known. Probably both collections have been growing over a long period, slowly absorbing verses commemorating monks or nuns living at quite different times, for although the commentary states that Ānanda recited these collections at the first council (Th-a I 4,18), other verses are supposed to be much younger even by the tradition, and as having been added on the occasion of the second council: Th 291–294 (Th-a II 123,5–14) or still later at the time of the third council under Aśoka<sup>176</sup>. So far, the chronology of Th/Thī has not attracted much attention<sup>177</sup>.

107. The verses of the monks and nuns allow a unique glimpse at very early Indian poetry otherwise completely lost. This has been rightly emphasised by S. Lienhard in a fundamental article<sup>178</sup>, where he was able to demonstrate that these verses mirror the secular poetry of their times and that they are partly love lyrics adapted to religious purposes, if secular is replaced by religious imagery. Poetical figures (*alaṃkāra*) known from much later poetry are found here for the first time.

The form of these single stanzas is not only the precursor of later *muktaka*-poetry as found in the Māhārāṣṭrī verses of Hāla (2nd/3rd century AD), it is also completely different from anything found in Vedic literature. This again demonstrates the very abrupt break between the Vedic and the Middle Indic traditions<sup>179</sup>, and it gives an at best vague idea of the highly valuable and beautiful poetry once existing in ancient India.

A classification of poets, which is again unique, found in the Theravāda canon (§ 81) further underlines that at an early date there were even attempts to build a theory on poetics.

108. Another aspect particularly of Thī no less valuable for cultural history is the fact that this is the first surviving poetry supposed to have been composed by women in India, sometimes in very famous poetical verses such as the lament of Ambapālī, the courtesan turned nun (Thī 252–270), which speak about the decay of her beauty, some-

<sup>176</sup> Norman 1983: 73.

<sup>177</sup> Th-trsl § 14. The attempt by Wüst 1928 was not very successful.

<sup>178</sup> Lienhard 1975, cf. Lienhard 1984: 75–79.

<sup>179</sup> v. Hinüber 1994b: 7.

times with grim humour, on the occasion of getting rid of an unpleasant husband (Thī 11). The poetically excellent quality of these verses is not matched by Indian poetesses of later periods<sup>180</sup>.

### II.2.5.10 The Jātaka

**Jātaka (Ja: 2.5.10):** Editions: V.Fausbøll I (1877), II (1879), III (1883), IV (1887), V (1891), VI (1896), VII (1897); F.Weller: Über die (!) Mandalay- und das Phayre Manuskript des Versjātaka. ZII 4.1926,46–93 = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1987, 244–291 [new edition of the verses of the **Ekanipāta**]; W.Bollée: **Kuṇḍalajātaka** Being an Edition and Translation. London 1970; R.Čičak-Chand: **Das Sāmajātaka**. Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und vergleichende Studie. Thesis Bonn 1974; translations: E.B.Cowell [Ed.]: The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births Translated from the Pāli ... London 1895, Vol. I – VI; J.Dutoit: Das Buch der Erzählungen aus den früheren Existenzen Buddhas. München I (1908), II (1909), III (1911), IV (1912), V (1914), VI (1916), VII [Nidānakathā, Index] (1921); Märchen aus dem alten Indien. Ausgewählt und übersetzt von E.Lüders. Jena 1921; M.Cone and R.Gombrich: The Perfect Generosity of Prince Vessantara. Oxford 1977; **Nidānakathā**: T.W. and C.A.F.Rhys Davids: Buddhist Birth-Stories, The Commentarial Introduction Entitled Nidānakathā. London n.d.[1925]; N.A. Jayawickrama: The Story of Gotama Buddha (Jātakanidāna). Oxford 1990; – R. O.Franke: Jātaka-Mahābhārata Parallelen. WZKM 20.1906,317–372 = Franke 1978: 344–399; J. Sakamoto-Goto: Les Stances en *mātrāchandas* dans le Jātaka. Thesis Paris 1982; Th.Oberlies: Der Text der Jātaka-Gāthās in Fausbølls Ausgabe. BEI 11/12. 1993/1994, 147–170; L.Grey: A Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories. Oxford 1990; <sup>2</sup>1995.

Commentary: Jātakatthavaṇṇanā (§261).

**109.** The collection of Jātakas “Birth Stories” consists of roughly 2500 verses numerically arranged in the Eka- to Terasa-Nipātas according to the number of verses in every single Ja from 1 to 13. Then follows a Pakiṇṇaka-Nipāta “miscellaneous verses”, 20- to 80-Nipāta and the Mahānipāta with ten long Ja, among them the Vessantara-ja.

<sup>180</sup> The rather insignificant amount of literature in Skt. written by women has been collected by Chaudhuri 1939–1943.



The total number of Ja was originally 550, but only 547 survive. The names and numbers of the three lost Ja are still known: 497. Velāma-ja, 498. Mahāgovinda-ja, 499. Sumedhapāṇḍita-ja, as though their content is lost (but cf. § 321). Reliefs extant in Burma depicting a single scene of each Ja do not give a clue as to the contents<sup>181</sup>.

550 Ja are only known to have existed in Burma once, where they were brought probably from Kāñcī in South India. This may also be the reason why the Ja-prose as handed down in Burma is a recension of its own, which is unique in the tradition of Pāli literature, and independent from the Ceylonese<sup>182</sup>.

It is not unlikely, though, that exactly 550 Ja were known in Ceylon as well. For this number is mentioned at Sv 612,19, Ps II 106,21 and As 31,34, cf. Thūp 170,3<sup>183</sup>. During the 14th century the Sinhalese king Parakkamabāhu IV. appointed a monk from South India as his spiritual preceptor (*rājaguru*) and heard from him 550 Ja (Mhv XC 82). It is perhaps not by chance that this number is here again connected with South India.

**110.** As the title indicates, these verses refer to previous lifes of the Buddha as a Bodhisatta, although frequently no connection to Buddhism can be found in the verses. They are developed into a Jātaka only by means of an accompanying prose story. The story, however, does not enjoy canonical status as do the verses, but is considered a commentary (§ 261)<sup>184</sup>. In spite of this it is necessary also to look at the Jātaka-atthavaṇṇanā “Explanation of the Meaning of the Ja” here already to understand the Jātakas.

**111.** A long introduction called *Nidānakathā*, Ja I 2,1–94,28 precedes the Ja proper. Here the life of the Buddha is told in prose interspersed with verses drawn from the *Buddhavaṃsa* (§ 125).

The *Nidānakathā* is divided into three chapters: The *Dūrenidāna* “Cause, Origin in the Remote Past” tells the story from the time of the former Buddha *Dīpaṃkara*, who declares that *Sumedha* will be a

<sup>181</sup> Martini 1963; Luce 1966. It is not impossible that quotations from these Ja survive unnoticed in grammatical literature: v. Hinüber 1983: 79[17].

<sup>182</sup> v. Hinüber 1983: 79[17]; 1988: 11. — On traces of different recensions of Ap and Cp cf. § 123 and § 128 respectively.

<sup>183</sup> It is considered to be a round number in Norman 1983: 79 note 316.

<sup>184</sup> There are rare instances of canonical prose: Bechert 1988: 122 [4].

future Buddha (Ja I 2,13–47,24), the Avidūrenidāna “Cause, Origin in the not so Remote Past” refers to the time from birth of the Bodhisatta in the Tusita heaven to the enlightenment (Ja I 47,26–77,2) and the Santikenidāna “Cause, Origin in the Near Past” is devoted to the time up to the Nirvāṇa (Ja I 77,4–94,28)<sup>185</sup>. At the end, the story of the gift of the Jetavana by Anāthapiṇḍika is told; it is in the Jetavana that most Ja are supposed to have been spoken by the Buddha<sup>186</sup>. The Nidānakathā is the most important Theravāda source for the life of the Buddha (cf. § 316).

**112.** All Ja have a strict formal structure. The first quarter of the first verse serves as headline<sup>187</sup>. The beginning of the Ja is called *paccuppannavatthu*, Ja II 440,6 “story of the present”, which refers to some event at the time of the Buddha, who then demonstrates the ultimate origin of that event by means of the *attavattthu*, Ja II 333,27 “story of the past”. This really is the Ja that also contains the *gāthā* “verse(s)”, which are accompanied by a word for word commentary called *veyyākaraṇa*. At the end, the story of the past and the one of the present are connected in the *samodhāna*, “connection”.

**113.** The Ja prose has a long history. Some Ja are found already in the canon itself, however in a different wording (§ 12,24,35). More important is the different form. For instead of *atīte* “in the past” that is necessarily put at the beginning of a Theravāda Ja, older texts, such as stories in the Sagāthavagga (§ 74), use *bhūtapubbam*, SN I 216,10 etc. “once upon a time”, cf. MN II 74,24sq. and Ja I 137,25sq. In the same way, the end of the Ja found in the canon is different<sup>188</sup>. Therefore, the Theravādins have modernized their Ja-text in contrast to other Buddhist schools<sup>189</sup>, where the old beginning and end of the Ja have been kept, and consequently the form of a Ja is typical for different Buddhist schools as will be demonstrated in a detailed study which is under preparation.

Because all Ja must have been accompanied by prose from the very beginning, although ancient prose texts are available only for

<sup>185</sup> This part includes 4.5.1 *Narasihagāthā*: Bechert 1967/8.

<sup>186</sup> Altogether 410: Ja-nidāna-trsl. Rhys Davids, table VII.

<sup>187</sup> The inscriptions at Bhārhut show that this has a long tradition: Lüders 1941: 137.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. e.g. DN II 196,9–12.

<sup>189</sup> Different Ja forms for Theravāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda and Mahāsāṃghikalokottaravāda can be distinguished.

very few Ja, it has been surmised that this prose was not necessarily transmitted in a fixed wording<sup>190</sup>. It is assumed that the story as such has been attached to a verse and was told in the words of the respective narrator. This particular type of literature with a given verse loosely surrounded by prose is called an *ākhyāna* “narrative” and can be traced back perhaps even to the Rig-veda<sup>191</sup>.

114. The prose, however, is essential only for the first 500 Ja. From the *Viśatīnīpāta* “division with 20 (verses)” onwards a new type of Ja begins: these are small epics long enough to be understood without any help of a prose text. The contents of some of these longer Ja are found at the same time in the Sanskrit epics, the *Mahābhārata* or the *Rāmāyaṇa*. They are of utmost importance far beyond Theravāda for the literary history particularly of the epics in ancient India<sup>192</sup>.

Thus the Ja collection divides in two parts: The first comprises Ja nos. 1–496 (or 1–499, if the three lost Ja are counted: § 109) or *Ekani-pāta* to *Pakiṇṇakanipāta*. A *Pakiṇṇaka* usually marks the end of a text, and here it contains Ja with 23, 25 or even 47 verses, thus contradicting the numerical arrangement, which continues with the *Viśatīnīpāta* “division of twenty”, if this is not the original end of a collection (cf. § 77). If this should be true, then it makes good sense that the Nidd II 80,4 = B<sup>c</sup> 164,17 gives the number of Ja as 500 and that Fa-hsien saw 500 representations of Ja when a procession with the tooth relique moved to the Abhayagiri vihāra in the 5th century<sup>193</sup>. Consequently, it is not unlikely that the Theravāda Ja is a composite collection consisting of 500 sets of verses plus 50 small epics<sup>194</sup>.

Whether there are traces of a split tradition mirrored in *Jātakas* of a form different from the Theravāda standard and surviving only

<sup>190</sup> The idea that this modernization was preceded by a Sinhalese version of the Ja prose, as suggested in Rhys Davids, *Ja-nidāna*-trsl. p. LXXVI, has been vigorously contradicted by Burlingame 1918, and rightly so.

<sup>191</sup> The long, and at times hot, discussion of the “*ākhyāna* theory” has been summed up by Alsdorf 1963/4. Interesting remarks on stories to be told when preaching have been made in Vism: Rahula 1966: XXVI; cf. also on Kv (§ 146) and Dīp (§ 183).

<sup>192</sup> This has been investigated by H.Lüders in a series of articles collected in Lüders 1940.

<sup>193</sup> Wang 1994: 172 mentions a Chinese translation of a “*Sūtra* of the Five Hundred *Jātakas*” prepared by the end of the 5th century and now lost.

<sup>194</sup> Wall paintings depicting 500 Ja in 13th century Burma are mentioned by Than Tun 1959: 75 besides 550 Ja, *ibidem* 76.

in the *Aṭṭhakathā*<sup>195</sup> is an open question, which again will be discussed in the forthcoming study mentioned above.

**115.** The narratives found in the Ja prose are mostly fables where the Bodhisatta is reborn as an animal, or fairy tales. The Ja is indeed one of the most important collections of such tales to have spread over large parts of Asia and Europe far beyond Buddhism<sup>196</sup>.

The longest of the epics and the most famous Ja is the *Vessantara-jā* with 786 verses<sup>197</sup>. It enjoys an immense popularity and is recited in Pāli from time to time in Theravāda countries until today<sup>198</sup>. It relates the last rebirth of the Bodhisatta, in which he accomplishes the perfection of giving away all his belongings (*dānapāramitā*) before he ascends to the Tusita heaven, from where he later enters his last existence by descending to this world.

### II.2.5.11 The Niddesa

**Mahāniddesa** (**Nidd I: 2.5.11<sup>1</sup>**): Edition: L. de La Vallée Poussin and E.J.Thomas I (1916), II (1917) [rev.: M.Bode, JRAS 1918,572–578]; – L.S.Cousins: Index to the Mahāniddesa. Oxford 1995.

**Cullāniddesa** (**Nidd II: 2.5.11<sup>2</sup>**): W.Stede 1918; B<sup>e</sup> 1956.

Commentary: Saddhammapajotikā (§ 287–290).

**116.** Both Niddesas, which are ascribed to Sāriputta (cf. § 119 on Paṭi), really form one text, which is called Suttaniddesa “Explanations of Suttas<sup>199</sup>” at the end of both Nidd I and Nidd II. The split into a “great” and “small” Niddesa seems to be attested to first in a Vinaya subcommentary of the 12th century: Sp-ṭ I 95,18<sup>200</sup>.

Nidd comments on the following verses of Sn:

Nidd I: *Aṭṭhakavagga*, Sn 766–975

Nidd II: *Pārāyānavagga*, Sn 976–1149 (end of Sn)

✕ *Khaggavisānasuttanta*, Sn 35–75

The fact that only these parts of Sn are explained confirms their existence as originally separate texts (§ 98).

<sup>195</sup> Cf. Law 1939.

<sup>196</sup> Laut 1993.

<sup>197</sup> Alsdorf 1957; on parallels from Sanskrit and other sources: Das Gupta 1978.

<sup>198</sup> Gabaude 1991.

<sup>199</sup> The word *niddesa* is explained at Nidd-a I 3,21–26.

<sup>200</sup> Also at Sv 15,25, but only in E<sup>e</sup>, while B<sup>e</sup> has Niddesa.

This is the only commentary besides the *Suttavibhaṅga* (§ 14) that has been included into the canon. An interesting remark on the history of Nidd is found in the *Vinaya* commentary, where it is reported that it was nearly lost, for at a certain time only a single monk named Mahārakkhita knew it by heart still: Sp 695,25–696,2.

117. The Nidd uses long series of synonyms to explain words occurring in Sn verses, and often uses formulas found in the canon as material, something that has been vaguely alluded to for the first time by M. Bode in her review of Nidd. These formulas, which originally helped monks to memorize texts, thus gain a new function as explicative formulas (§ 234)<sup>201</sup>.

Nidd occasionally quotes directly from the canon, but only from the *Sutta-piṭaka*. It is interesting that not all quotations marked as such in the text can be verified<sup>202</sup>.

118. The age of Nidd has been discussed at great length by S. Lévi 1925, who arrives at a date in the 2nd century AD, arguing from the geographical horizon of the text. This date has been disputed recently by Norman 1983: 84,86, who argues in favour of a much earlier date at the time of Aśoka. The question needs reexamination<sup>203</sup>. It is, however, certain that Nidd does not belong to the old canonical texts and that also a date after Aśoka does not seem unlikely<sup>204</sup>.

#### II.2.5.12 The *Paṭisambhidāmagga*

***Paṭisambhidāmagga* (Paṭis: 2.5.12):** Edition: A.C. Taylor 1905/07; translation: *The Path of Discrimination* Trsl. by Ñāṇamoli with an Introduction by A.K. Warder. London 1982 [rev.: L.S. Cousins, IJ 28.1985, 209–212].

Commentary: *Saddhammapakāsinī* (§ 291–297).

119. The *Paṭisambhidāmagga* “Path of Discrimination<sup>205</sup>” is the only *Abhidhamma* text that has found its way into the *Khuddakanikāya*,

<sup>201</sup> v. Hinüber 1994b: 26sq.

<sup>202</sup> Nidd I 513–516; Nidd II 289–291. One quotation from a total of 41 in Nidd I and three from a total of 21 in Nidd II are untraced.

<sup>203</sup> Cf. also Sarkar 1981, cf. Norman 1983: 87 note 373.

<sup>204</sup> But “cannot be later than the date of the fixing of the canon”, Norman: Sn-trsl. II, p. XXVI: This means not later than 1st century BC.

<sup>205</sup> An alternative title is simply *Paṭisambhidā*, Sv 566,4 = Mp III 159,7.

probably because it was composed too late (perhaps 2nd century AD<sup>206</sup>) to be included into the Abhidhammapiṭaka, which was already closed, while the end of the Khuddakanikāya always remained open for additions (§ 151, 156).

As Nidd (§ 116) also Paṭis is ascribed to Sāriputta (Paṭis-a I 1,18\*), who talks about the four *paṭisambhidās* in the Catukkanipāta of AN II 160,19–37<sup>207</sup>.

Paṭis is divided into Mahā-, Yuganandha- and Paññāvagga “Great, Coupling”, and “Wisdom Division”, which are subdivided into ten *kathās* each, a term rarely used for this purpose.

As a true Abhidhamma text, Paṭis begins with a *mātikā* “summary” (§ 131) containing 73 different aspects on *ñāṇa* “knowledge”, which are then explained in detail. The second chapter, on the other hand, begins with a series of questions to be answered in the following text, which, however, is not a dialogue.

Sometimes Paṭis quotes from and comments on texts from the AN, sometimes from SN and rarely from DN.

120. The purpose of Paṭis may be the first and not very successful<sup>208</sup> attempt to systematize the Abhidhamma in the form of a handbook. If so, it could be a forerunner of both Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga (§ 248). In contrast to these later texts, which are well organized and composed with great care, Paṭis seems rather to be patched together.

Both, Nidd and Paṭis have been rejected by the Mahāsaṃgītika at the second council according to Dīpavaṃsa V 37, which clearly is an anachronism. As both texts give an orthodox interpretation of canonical Theravāda literature, it is easy to understand why they could not possibly have been accepted by any other school.

### II.2.5.13 The Apadāna

**Apadāna (Ap: 2.5.13):** M.E.Lilley I (1925), II (1927)<sup>209</sup>; – H.Bechert: Grammatisches aus dem Apadāna-Buch. ZDMG 108.1958, 308–316.

Commentary: Visuddhajanavilāsini (§ 302–304).

<sup>206</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 106; 1972: 124–127; without referring to Frauwallner and with a widely differing result, entirely based on speculation: Paṭis-trsl p. XXXIV.

<sup>207</sup> On the concept of *paṭisambhidā* (Skt. *pratisamvid*): Lamotte 1970: 1616–1624.

<sup>208</sup> Frauwallner 1972: 126.

<sup>209</sup> Part of Ap has been reedited by S.Mellick: A critical edition with translation of selected portions of the Pāli Apadāna. Thesis, Oxford 1993, which will be published in due course, cf. Mellick Cutler 1994.

121. The Apadāna, which is not recognized as canonical by the *Dīghabhāṇakas* (§ 85), is one of the last books added to the canon. It seems to be younger than the *Buddhavamsa* (§ 124)<sup>210</sup>, but much older than the commentaries. The geographical horizon seems to be similar to the one of *Nidd* (§ 118)<sup>211</sup>.

The exact meaning of the title, which corresponds to Skt. *avadāna*, and which designates a class of literature, is not known<sup>212</sup>.

122. The text is divided into four parts:

1. Buddha-ap: a praise of the Buddhas and their respective fields<sup>213</sup>
2. Paccekabuddha-ap: the Buddha answers Ānanda's question about those Buddhas who gained enlightenment, but did not teach<sup>214</sup>
3. Thera-ap: 55 Vaggas of 10 Apadānas each spoken by monks
4. Therī-ap: 4 Vaggas of 10 Apadānas each spoken by nuns

The original number of Thera-apadānas was 550, which has been reduced to 547<sup>215</sup>, probably after three Jātakas were lost (§ 109). Ap describes the former lives of monks and nuns, some of whom are known to have spoken the Thera- and Therīgāthās. Thus, this collection is a kind of supplement to *Th/Thī* and at the same time parallel to the Ja describing the former lives of the Buddha.

123. Three recensions of the Ap can be traced, for *Dhammapāla* quotes in his commentary to *Th/Thī* Apadānas in a wording different from Ap (§ 283) and a third recension has been used by the commentator on *Sñ* in *Pj* II (§ 255)<sup>216</sup>.

Moreover, some passages of the Apādāna are near to texts from other Buddhist schools: Ap no. 390 *Pubbakammapiḷoti* runs partly parallel to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Anavataptagāthā*<sup>217</sup>.

<sup>210</sup> Bechert 1958: 18.

<sup>211</sup> Cf. Bechert 1958: 19.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. CPD, BHSD, SWTF s.vv.

<sup>213</sup> The content of this chapter is unusual in Theravāda: Bechert 1992: 102.

<sup>214</sup> Only this section is composed in *triṣṭubh*-verses.

<sup>215</sup> Bechert 1958: 13–15.

<sup>216</sup> Bechert 1958: 18.

<sup>217</sup> Bechert 1961: 29.

## II.2.5.14 The Buddhavaṃsa

**Buddhavaṃsa (Bv: 2.5.14):** Buddhavaṃsa and Cariyāpiṭaka. New Edition by N.A.Jayawickrama. London 1974<sup>218</sup>; translation: Chronicle of the Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) and Basket of Conduct (Cariyāpiṭaka). The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon III. Translated by I.B.Horner. London 1975; – R.Meisezahl: Der Buddhavaṃsa und seine Textgeschichte. Thesis Bonn 1944.

Commentary: Madhuratthavilāsinī (§ 298–301).

**124.** This “Lineage of the Buddhas” is a description of the lives of 24 predecessors of the historical Buddha in verse, beginning with Dīpaṃkara, who predicted that Sumedha would be a future Buddha. The first chapter is an introduction and Bv XXVI relates the life of the Buddha Gotama. A Pakiṇṇakakathā “chapter with miscellaneous matters” follows, and again the former Buddhas are enumerated with three Buddhas, Taṇhaṃkara, Medhaṃkara, and Saraṇaṃkara added, and Metteyya the future Buddha mentioned. According to the commentary (Bv-a 295,32), the verses were added by the participants of the first council and are consequently not *buddhavacana*.

Six predecessors of the Buddha occur already in the Dīghanikāya (§ 59). The number of 24 predecessors given in Bv is probably analogous to the corresponding number of Jaina Tīrthaṃkaras<sup>219</sup>.

**125.** The contents of Bv partly overlaps with the Ja-nidāna (§ 111), where verses from Bv are quoted. The same is true for the introduction to the Atthasālinī (§ 316).

A quotation from an otherwise unknown \*Dvādasasahasabuddhavaṃsa, which may be ascribed to the Abhayagiri vihārin (§ 43 sq.) has been discovered recently by P.Skilling<sup>220</sup>.

<sup>218</sup> Editions usually abbreviate the text of Bv, cf. e.g. Bv IV 13 (note 17) with Bv-a 150,31 and Guha 1982/1983. – An inscription in the Le<sup>3</sup>myak-nha temple at Pagan contains an inscripational version of Bv differing from the printed editions; ed. by Daw Tin Tin Myint, Rangoon 1981.

<sup>219</sup> Gombrich 1980. Without referring to Gombrich, Ohira 1994 argues for a priority of the 24 Tīrthaṃkaras of the Jainas.

<sup>220</sup> Skilling 1993a. – A short parallel to Bv on the Buddha Maṅgala, Bv IV is found in Mv I 250,5\*-252,19\*. The preceding Dīpaṃkaravastu has no connection to Bv.



## II.2.5.15 The Cariyāpiṭaka

**Cariyāpiṭaka (Cp: 2.5.15):** Edition: see Buddhavaṃsa; translations: see Buddhavaṃsa; P.S.Dhammārāma: Cariyā-Piṭaka. Corbeille de la Conduite. BEFEO 51.1963, 325–390.

Commentary: Paramatthadīpanī (§ 285).

126. This is the only title in the Tipiṭaka also containing the word *piṭaka*: “Basket of Conduct”. A second title is mentioned at the end of Cp: *Buddhāpadānīyaṃ nāma dhammapariyāyaṃ*, which brings this text near to the Apadāna (§ 121 sq.).

At the same time, Cp is closely connected to Bv. In the introduction, Sāriputta asks the Buddha about his resolve to become a Buddha (*abhinthāra*) and about the ten perfections (*pāramī*). The first question is answered in Bv, as clearly seen in the commentary: Cp-a 6,11–27, and only the second in Cp, although only six perfections are actually treated in Cp. This is supplemented in a long appendix to the commentary: Cp-a 276,26–332,30, where all ten *pāramīs* are explained<sup>221</sup>.

127. Cp is divided into three sections and contains 35 stories from the former lives of the Buddha as a Bodhisatta. Consequently, the contents of Cp is near to the Ja, where 32 from 35 stories can be traced. In Cp, however, the verses have been provided with a strong Buddhist touch often missing in Ja verses. Therefore, the author of the prose Ja likes to quote verses from Cp<sup>222</sup>.

128. The Ja-nidāna also quotes a Cp containing 35 stories, which are not always identical with those actually found in Cp. Further, in this second recension of Cp all ten perfections are demonstrated<sup>223</sup>. It seems to be nearer to the canonical Mahāvihāra-Ja: Cp II 6 = Cp 288–306 is called *Temiyapaṇḍita*, a name used for the corresponding Ja no. 538 in the Burmese Ja tradition, most likely rooted in South India (§ 109), while it is called in the second recension of Cp *Mūgapakha*, Ja I 46,25 as in the Ceylonese Ja.

Thus Dhammapāla comments upon a Cp perhaps connected to South India. At the same time he uses a different Ap-recension (§ 123),

<sup>221</sup> On the perfections: Bechert 1961: 33sq.; Lamotte 1949b: 650–1113.

<sup>222</sup> Alsdorf 1957: 2–14.

<sup>223</sup> Cf. Bechert 1961: 30 note 2.

which may be South Indian as well. Therefore, it is possible that a South Indian Cp, originally called *Buddhāpadānīya Dhammapariyāya* (§ 126) gained canonical status also in the Mahāvihāra, because it was commented upon in the *Paramatthadīpanī*, whereas the Ceylonese Cp survives only in the *Ja-nidāna*. *Dhammapāla*'s Ap-recension on the other hand, on which there is no old commentary at all, was not accepted by the Mahāvihāra.

### II.3 The Basket of Things Relating to the Teaching

129. The *Abhidhammapitaka* is considerably younger than both *Vinaya-* and *Suttapitaka*, and originated, according to Frauwallner, between 200 BC and 200 AD<sup>224</sup>. It is not mentioned in the account of the first council (§ 8). Three parts of the canon are referred to for the first time in a late part of the *Suttavibhaṅga* in the *Vinaya*: *Vin IV 344,17*<sup>225</sup>. The word *abhidhamme* occurs in earlier parts of the canon, but without any technical connotation simply meaning "things relating to the teaching"<sup>226</sup>. The commentary explains *abhidhamma* as "higher *dhamma*", *As 2,14*.

130. The Theravāda-*Abhidhamma* comprises seven parts:

1. *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*: 13 *bhāṇavāra* (cf. § 134)
2. *Vibhaṅga*: 35 *bhāṇavāra*
3. *Dhātukathā*: 6 *bhāṇavāra*
4. *Puggalapaññatti*: 5 *bhāṇavāra*
5. *Kathāvatthu*: 64 *bhāṇavāra*
6. *Yamaka*: 2000 *bhāṇavāra*
7. *Paṭṭhāna*: no figure given<sup>227</sup>

This division is described for the first time in the introduction to the *Milindapañha*, *Mil 12,21–31*, and discussed at length in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* commentary: *As 3,21–10,30*. Here, an eighth text that does not survive is mentioned. For the commentary says that the

<sup>224</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 106.

<sup>225</sup> Cf. *Vin IV 144,3*; *Nidd I 238,27sq.*; *Mil 13,7*, CPD s.v.

<sup>226</sup> Details have been discussed in v. Hinüber 1994c: 110.

<sup>227</sup> Figures according to *As 7,5–9,14*. When expanded, all treatises become *appamāṇa* "endless".

Vitaṇḍavādins rejected the Kathāvatthu as not spoken by the Buddha (§ 144) and replaced it by the Mahādhammahadaya, which could correspond in some way or other to the Dhammahadayavibhaṅga, Vibh 401–521: As 3,25–34; 8,5 (§ 139)<sup>228</sup>.

131. The origin and history of Abhidhamma<sup>229</sup> not only in Theravāda but also in other schools has been traced in a series of articles by E.Frauwallner, on which the following is largely based<sup>230</sup>.

The teaching of the Buddha as preserved in the Suttapiṭaka is not arranged systematically, in spite of some early attempts, such as the last two Suttantas in DN (§ 62), particularly DN no. 34 Dasuttarasuttanta, containing lists on different concepts of the Dhamma. Therefore, the commentary calls this text a *mātikā*, Sv 1054,29 with much justification. The term *mātikā* refers to lists or summaries typical for Abhidhamma texts, which usually begin with a *mātikā* naming the items to be explained in the following text<sup>231</sup>. The idea of creating *mātikās* seems to have been borrowed from the Vinaya, because *mātikās* are found already in the Vinayapiṭaka, and because this word refers to the Pātimokkhasutta (§ 15) in the frequent formula *dhama-madhara, vinayadhara, mātikādhara*<sup>232</sup>. These *mātikās* came into existence once the Buddhists tried to go beyond the simple collection of discourses of the Buddha and began to arrange the main points of his teaching in a systematic form which at the same time could be easily memorized<sup>233</sup>.

The lists thus created needed explanation, just as the late Vedic Sūtra texts are hardly understandable without a commentary. Thus the *mātikās* may be the Buddhist answer to the Vedic Sūtras<sup>234</sup>.

### II.3.1 The Dhammasaṅgaṇī

**Dhammasaṅgaṇī (Dhs: 3.1):** Editions: E.Müller 1885; P.V.Bapat and R.D.Vadekar. Poona 1940 (N°); translations: A Buddhist manual of

<sup>228</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 112.

<sup>229</sup> ~~There are schools, which do not possess an Abhidhamma:~~ Lamotte 1958/ 1988: 198 sq./180sq.

<sup>230</sup> Frauwallner: 1963, 1964, 1971a, 1971b, 1973.

<sup>231</sup> The Abhidhamma-mātikās have been discussed by A.K.Warder in the introduction to Moh p. XIX–XXVII, without however referring to Frauwallner.

<sup>232</sup> v. Hinüber 1994c.

<sup>233</sup> Frauwallner 1964: 59sq.

<sup>234</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 104.

Psychological Ethics. London 1900, <sup>2</sup>1923; Nyanaponika: Dhammasaṅgaṇī. Kompendium der Dingwelt. Hamburg 1950; A. Bareau: Dhammasaṅgaṇī. Traduction Annotée. Thèse Complémentaire. Paris 1951; – T. Tabata: Index to the Dhammasaṅgaṇī. London 1987.

Commentaries: Atthasālinī (§ 315–317); Atthasālinīmūlaṭṭikā (§ 356); Atthasālinīanuṭṭikā (§ 360); Atthasālinīatthayojanā (§ 379); on the *mātikā*: Mohavicchedanī (§ 354).

132. Besides Dhammasaṅgaṇī “Collection of *dhammas*”, old texts also know the alternative title Dhammasaṅgaha of the same meaning: Sp 151,1; Vibh-a 432,15. Further, the title Abhidhammasaṅgaṇī is found in old manuscripts, which is to be considered as a mistake.

133. Dhs begins abruptly with a *mātikā* and without any introduction, which has irritated the Theravādins in olden times, for the commentary reports attempts to create a *nidāna* for Dhs. This is either taken from an existing Suttanta or made up for this very text: “at one time the Buddha stayed in the Tāvattīmsa heaven ... and taught the Abhidhamma”, As 30,16–31,16.

This introduction refers to the tradition that the Buddha first taught the Abhidhamma to his ~~deceased mother in heaven~~ during the fourth week after his enlightenment : As 13,12<sup>235</sup>. The motive behind this idea is easy to see. If the late Abhidhamma was to be considered as *buddhavacana*, it was imperative to find some place where it could have been spoken, as is usual in the Suttantas and Vinaya texts alike. Of course, there was and could not possibly be any tradition on place names, and consequently the displacement into heaven was a wise move, with no local Buddhist community being able to object, because it was not mentioned in the *nidāna*.

The tradition on earth begins with Sāriputta and includes Mahinda, who brought the Abhidhamma to Ceylon according to As 32,13–20. The series of names given there seems to be inspired by the Parivāra, Vin V 3,1 (§ 42).

134. The subdivision of Dhs, which seems to be a bit confusing at a first glance, has been explained by Frauwallner as follows<sup>236</sup>:

<sup>235</sup> Lamotte 1958/1988: 200/182sq.

<sup>236</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 117sq. – The arrangement of the text in N° is superior to E°.

- A. Mātikā
  - a. abhidhamma-mātikā  
kusalā, akusalā, abyākatā dhammā
  - b. suttanta-mātikā: The source is DN no. 33 Saṅgītisuttanta with additions<sup>237</sup>
- I. Cittuppāda-kaṇḍa § 1–582; length: 6 *bhāṇavāra*
  - 1. kusala § 1–364
    - a. kāmāvacara
    - b. rūpāvacara
    - c. lokuttara
  - 2. akusala § 365–430
  - 3. abyākata § 431–582
- II. Rūpa-kaṇḍa § 584–980; length: 2 *bhāṇavāra*  
Mātikā § 584–594
- III. Nikkhepa-kaṇḍa § 981–1367: commentary on A.Mātikā; length: 3 *bhāṇavāra*
- IV. Atthuddhāra-kaṇḍa (Atthakathā-kaṇḍa) § 1368–1599; length: 2 *bhāṇavāra*

This division is also discussed in the commentary, where the titles are slightly different: Cittavibhatti, Rūpavibhatti, Nikkheparāsi and Atthuddhāra, As 6,13–7,9 (cf. Dīp v 37?). Further, it is stated that Dhs can be expanded endlessly, As 7,6. Thus the text is seen as an open system somewhat similar to SN (§ 70).

135. It is easy to see that the frame of Dhs forms a unit, for A+III+IV belong together as Mātikā (A) and the corresponding explanation (III+IV) which have been separated by inserting two pieces (I+II)<sup>238</sup>. Part II. Rūpakaṇḍa is easily recognized as an originally separate text with its own Mātikā.

The complete A. Mātikā is explained in full in III. Nikkhepakaṇḍa only, while IV. Atthuddhāra-kaṇḍa is concerned only with A.a Abhidhamma-Mātikā, which indicates that A.b Suttanta-Mātikā and its commentary may be a secondary addition<sup>239</sup>. As IV. Atthuddhāra-kaṇḍa shows some connections to I. Cittuppādakaṇḍa<sup>240</sup>, which is a

<sup>237</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 118.

<sup>238</sup> On the different age of these inserted parts: Frauwallner 1971b: 111, 115, 117.

<sup>239</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 121.

<sup>240</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 124.

later addition, it should be younger than III. Nikkhepaṇḍa. Thus it seems that the Abhidhamma-Mātikā together with III. Nikkhepaṇḍa form the oldest part of Dhs.

136. The Dhs is a compilation from different sources. According to Frauwallner this text is the youngest one among those found in the Abhidhammapitaka. Consequently, Dhs mirrors the state of development of Theravāda philosophy at the time, when the third Piṭaka was closed<sup>241</sup>.

137. The language of the Abhidhamma texts is clearly distinct from the usage found in the first two Piṭakas. Brief questions are answered by lists of concepts very often in formulas. Thus the Abhidhamma texts use a method of explanation also found in the Niddesa, with its explicative formulas. The linguistic relation between these two types of texts, and again their relation to the old oral formulas in the Sutta-piṭaka, would make an interesting study which might tell much about relative chronology<sup>242</sup>.

### II.3.2 The Vibhaṅga

**Vibhaṅga (Vibh. 3.2):** Edition: C.A.F. Rhys Davids 1904; Translation: The Book of Analysis (Vibhaṅga). The Second Book of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka Translated by U Thittila. London 1969.

Commentaries: Sammohavinodanī (§ 318–321); Vibhaṅgamūlaṭṭhikā (§ 356); Vibhaṅgaanufikā (§ 360); Gūḷhatthadīpanī [Vibh-ṭ] (§ 308); Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathāatthayojanā (§ 379); on the *mātikā*: Mohavicchedanī (§ 354).

138. The term *vibhaṅga* “explanation, commentary” is mentioned already in older parts of the canon (§ 64). In contrast to Dhs, Vibh does not begin with a *mātikā*, which however can be reconstructed by comparing parallel texts of other schools<sup>243</sup>.

The Vibh comprises 18 chapters. A first *mātikā* is treated in chapters 1–6, a second one in 7–15. These *mātikās* consist of very old lists, such as the five *khandhas*, the twelve *āyatanas* etc., which are

<sup>241</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 118.

<sup>242</sup> For the time being cf. Sadd 6.1.1.3.

<sup>243</sup> Frauwallner 1964: 77; 1971b: 107sq.

frequently discussed in the Suttapiṭaka. Thus Vibh systematizes old material, and this text is considered to be the oldest in the Abhidhammapiṭaka.

Starting from Frauwallner's observations, Bronkhorst<sup>244</sup> has even tried to maintain that an early form of the Vibhaṅga had been compiled during the first century after the Nirvāṇa, which seems too early a date.

139. The last three chapters of Vibh (Vibh 306–436) were originally independent small books on Abhidhamma separate from the beginning of the text. Chapter 16. Nāṇavibhaṅga is arranged according to the same numerical principle as AN.

The last chapter is the Dhammahadayaavibhaṅga (Vibh 401–436) with a *mātikā* of its own. Perhaps this treatise is identical with or similar to the Mahādhammahadaya accepted by the Viṇṇayavādins as canonical instead of the Kathāvatthu (§ 130).

### II.3.3 The Dhātukathā

**Dhātukathā (Dhātuk: 3.3):** Edition: E.R.Gooneratne 1892; translation: Discourse on the Elements (Dhātu-Kathā). The Third Book of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka Translated by U Nārada. London 1962.

Commentaries: Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā (§ 322); Pañcappakaraṇamūlaṭṭhikā (§ 356); Līnatthavaṇṇanā (§ 360); Dhātukathāatthayojanā (§ 380); on the *mātikā*: Mohavicchedanī (§ 354):

140. This text, too, begins with a *mātikā* split in two parts. The 14 items mentioned in the first part provide at the same time the division of the text (cf. As 6,11–20), and those contained in the second part are combined with them. The central theme of Dhātuk is the relation of different concepts to the *dhātus* “elements”<sup>245</sup>.

It is stated at Spk II 201,25 that Dhātuk and some other parts of the Abhidhammapiṭaka were not recited during the first three councils (cf. § 437 note 722).

### II.3.4 The Puggalapaññatti

**Puggalapaññatti (Pp: 3.4):** Edition R.Morris 1883, reprinted together with Pp-a and a new index by I.B.Horner. London 1972; translations:

<sup>244</sup> Bronkhorst 1985: 309; 381.

<sup>245</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 113sq.

Nyanatiloka: *Puggala Paññatti*: Das Buch der Charaktere aus dem buddhistischen Pāli-Kanon zum ersten Male übersetzt. Breslau 1910; Designation of Human Types. Translated into English from the *Puggalapaññatti* for the First Time by B.C.Law. London 1924.

Commentaries: *Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā* (§ 322); *Pañcappakaraṇamūlatikā* (§ 356); *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* (§ 360); on the *mātikā*: *Mohavicchedanī* (§ 354).

**141.** The *mātikā* of Pp comprises six *paññattis* “concepts”, of which the first five have been taken over from the common Abhidhammamātikā, and only the last one is *puggala* “individuum, person”, which is actually explained in the text<sup>246</sup>. The different types of persons are arranged in groups from one to ten, and, as in AN, the numbers of the last three groups are reached at only by adding up two sets of persons (cf. § 77).

**142.** Except for the *mātikā*, this text is particularly near to DN no. 35 Dasuttarasuttanta (§ 62) and to AN, and indeed texts from AN have been included in Pp though not mechanically, for the address *bhikkhave* “monks” has been regularly removed from the text. Thus the “remembered orality” (§ 55) prevalent in the Suttantas and even in the Vinaya texts has been given up in favour of the style adequate for a treatise on philosophy.

**143.** The redactor of Pp limited his efforts to a collection of material from other parts of the canon without developing any ideas of his own on the concept of person. Therefore, it is impossible to relate Pp to the history of philosophical ideas and to other Abhidhamma texts in order to arrive at a relative date. Moreover, there is no parallel text in any other Buddhist school: The *Prajñāptiśāstra* of the Sarvāstivādins is completely different<sup>247</sup>. Consequently, Pp seems to be a typical Theravāda creation not belonging to the common stock of Abhidhamma texts.

### II.3.5 The Kathāvatthu

**Kathāvatthu (Kv 3.5):** Edition: A.C.Taylor I (1894), II (1897); translation: Points of Controversy ... Translation ... by Shwe Yan Aung and

<sup>246</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 114.

<sup>247</sup> Cf. Dietz 1994 with an English summary in Dietz 1992.



C.A.F Rhys Davids. London 1915; – T.Tabata: Index to the Kathāvatthu. London 1982.

Commentaries: Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā (§ 322); Pañcappakaraṇamūlaṭṭhikā (§ 356); Līnatthavaṇṇanā (§ 360); on the *mātikā*: Mohavicchedanī (§ 354).

144. The Kathāvatthu “Text Dealing with Disputes” is quite different from the other six treatises of the Abhidhammapiṭaka. For it does not list dhammas, but aims at the refutation of heretical views.

According to tradition, it was composed by Moggalliputtatissa 218 years after the Nirvāṇa (As 4,25). Consequently, this is the only canonical text exactly dated to the year in the tradition itself.

As mentioned earlier (§ 130) the canonicity of Kv was not universally accepted, because it clearly is not *buddhavacana*. However, it is saved as such by the view that the Buddha had spoken the *mātikā* in heaven (As 4,3–30), which Moggalliputtatissa unfolded (cf. § 70, 237) at the third council after Aśoka had purged the Saṃgha (Kv-a 6,2–7,29). When the canon was recited on this occasion, Kv was included. Obviously, the tradition was always aware of the relatively late date of Kv<sup>248</sup>.

145. The Kv is divided into four Paṇṇāsaka “groups of 50 (points to be discussed)”, which are subdivided into 20 Vaggas each with a varying number of disputed items. At the end, three further Vaggas are added<sup>249</sup>. This somewhat irregular structure seems to indicate that the text had been growing over a certain time, and whenever new controversies arose they were included<sup>250</sup>.

In contrast to other Abhidhamma texts, Kv does not begin with *no* or is it based on a *mātikā*. As it was felt that an Abhidhamma text simply needs a *mātikā*, it has been inserted into an existing text (Kv 11,6–13,24), which is centred around problems connected to *puggala* “person”. This is by far the longest discussion in Kv, and probably an old part, for there is also a chapter on *pudgala* in the parallel text used by the Sarvāstivādins, the Vijñānakāya<sup>251</sup>.

<sup>248</sup> On the date of Kv: Frauwallner 1952: 258.

<sup>249</sup> This division has not been followed strictly either in Kv or in Kv-trsl.; it can be seen at Kv-a p. XXVII–XXXI.

<sup>250</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 124.

<sup>251</sup> Vallée Poussin 1925.

146. It has been observed that there are linguistically old forms, so called Māgadhisms, in the Puggala chapter of Kv<sup>252</sup>. These Māgadhisms are limited to certain formulas used in the discussion. This again shows that the beginning of Kv has been built from old material. It does not mean, however, that Kv was formulated originally in eastern India or in the early eastern language of Buddhism (§ 7), because fragments from an early oral method of discussion may survive here. This is all the more interesting, as the text of Kv is not always really understandable without further explanation. Obviously, a possibly originally oral commentary had to accompany the text. Thus this type of text tradition is in a way surprisingly near to that of the Jātaka (§ 113).

147. A little more than 200 points are discussed in Kv, although it seems that the tradition assumes a larger number. According to the commentaries (As 2,24; Kv-a 7,22), Moggalliputtatissa used 500 orthodox, and the same number of heretical, Suttantas to demonstrate his purpose.

148. There are indeed quotations from the Suttaṭīṭaka<sup>253</sup>, which are always accepted as authority also by the opponents of the Theravādin. It is interesting that sometimes the wording seems to be slightly different from the received text.

Among these quotations is a verse from the Nidhikaṇḍa (§ 86), the only reference to a text from the Khuddakanikāya, which, however, seems to have existed as a separate text originally. Thus this quotation has no bearing on the existence of this Nikāya.

149. It is evident that Kv is a source of the highest possible value for the history of Buddhist philosophy, which has found due attention in research<sup>254</sup>.

The discussions in Kv are developed in a very peculiar, prelogical way of arguing perhaps originally developed in eastern India (§ 146).

<sup>252</sup> Norman 1979.

<sup>253</sup> There are no quotations from either Vinaya- or Abhidhammapīṭaka. The evidence collected in "passages in the Kv quoted from the Pīṭakas" in Kv-trsl, Appendix p. 401–404, cf. the older list in DN-trsl. I (1899) p. XII, is misleading, because slightly similar wordings and true quotations have not been duly separated.

<sup>254</sup> Lamotte 1956b; Cousins 1991 (with older literature). No progress is achieved by Dube 1980.

At the same time, some features of the much later Indian logic seem to be anticipated here in an early form. Therefore, Kv deserves much more attention than has been devoted to it so far in the history of Indian logic, in spite of some valuable studies<sup>255</sup>.

A further urgent need for the study of Kv is a new translation, as the existing one gives hardly more than a very rough idea of the actual contents.

**150.** A strong disadvantage of the presentation of the controversies in Kv is the lack of any indication of the respective school to which the heretical views under discussion may belong. These are mentioned much later only in the commentary (§ 322). In this respect Kv differs from the *Vijñānakāya*, where the interlocutors are named.

**151.** It is not entirely obvious why Kv has been included in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*. The form of the text, which contains discussions, is nearer to the *Suttantās* than to the *Abhidhamma*. On the other hand, *Paṭi*s, which is much more an *Abhidhamma* text than Kv, was included only in the *Khuddakanikāya* (§ 119) and not in the third *Piṭaka*, where it really belongs. The reason may be chronology. At the time when Kv was formed under Aśoka, the four great *Nikāyas* may have been closed collections already, while the *Abhidhamma* was still open. That had changed when *Paṭi*s came into existence. If the 2nd century AD is approximately correct, then evidently the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* was closed as well, and only the *Khuddakanikāya* remained always open for new texts such as *Paṭi*s and others (§ 156).

### II.3.6 The Yamaka

**Yamaka (Yam: 3.6):** Edition: C.A.F. Rhys Davids I (1911), II (1913); translation: does not exist.

Commentaries: *Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā* (§ 322); *Pañcappakaraṇamūlaṭṭkā* (§ 356); *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* (§ 360); on the *mātikā*: *Mohavicchedanī* (§ 354).

**152.** The Yamaka “Pairs” is a large text of perhaps more than 2500 pages, if printed in full: All editions are strongly abbreviated.

<sup>255</sup> Schayer 1933; Warder 1960; Bronkhorst 1993.

Following the tradition, Yam comprises the enormous number of 2000 *bhāṇavāras* (As 9,1)<sup>256</sup>.

Following Frauwallner<sup>257</sup>, the original idea behind the title was that pairs are constituted by the origin of one thing, which conditions the origin of a second one. The tradition derives the title from different sets of pairs.

153. According to the commentary (Yam-a 52,17–53,5), there are three sets of pairs: 1. Atthayamaka ; 2. Dhammayamaka and 3. Pucchāyamaka, besides an additional second division into ten pairs also named in the commentary (Yam-a 52,9–13 ≠ As 8,34–38). These items, which actually follow the Vibhaṅgamātikā, are recognized as a *mātikā* much later in the Mohavicchedanī (Moh 278,2, cf. § 354).

The subdivision of Yam is still more complicated, and it is important for the history of the text that the seventh of the ten *yamakas* does not occur in the Vibhaṅgamātikā, which has been observed by the commentary already (Yam-a 84,8). This chapter may be a later addition.

All *yamakas* are discussed at great length and all conceivable combinations have been enumerated: “an excellent example of how the method of Abhidhamma can be expatiated insipidly” (Frauwallner<sup>258</sup>), in stark contrast to the tradition on a certain part of Yam: *pāḷi paṇ' ettha atisaṅkhittā*, Moh 279,14 on the Mūla-Yam: “the text is succinct to the extreme”.

### II.3.7 The Paṭṭhāna

**Paṭṭhāna (Paṭṭh: 3.7):** Edition: Tikapaṭṭhāna (Tikap): C.A.F.Rhys Davids I (1921), II (1922), III (1923); Dukapaṭṭhāna (Dukap): C.A.F.Rhys Davids I (1906)<sup>259</sup> [rev.: L. de La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1907, 452–456]; translation: U Nārada: Conditional Relations. London I (1969), II (1981); – U Nārada: Guide to Conditional Relations. London I (1979).

<sup>256</sup> E.g. MN has 80 *bhāṇavāras*.

<sup>257</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 116.

<sup>258</sup> Frauwallner 1971b: 117.

<sup>259</sup> There is no second part. Due to an editorial error (cf. Duka-paṭṭh p. X), it was assumed that Duka-paṭṭh is the first and not the second part of the text.

Commentaries: Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā (§ 322); Pañcappakaraṇamūlaṭṭhikā (§ 356); Līnatthavaṇṇanā (§ 360); on the *mātikā*: Mohavicchedanī (§ 354).

**154.** This text has been abbreviated in the PTS edition to such a degree that it forbids our forming any clear picture of its structure or contents. Therefore, the comparison of the Burmese edition (1959–1967) in five volumes is imperative: Tikap 317–355 e.g. corresponds to about 700 pages in B<sup>e</sup>.

This huge and by far the longest single text found in the Tipiṭaka is simply called Mahāpakaraṇa “Large Treatise” (As 9,3): The number of *bhāṇavāras* seems to be incalculable, as it is not given (As 9,16).

The title is explained as “basis (for all other Abhidhamma texts)” (Tikap-a 9,27), for the 24 Tikas “groups of three” and the 100 Dukas “groups of two” are considered to be the *mātikā* for all Abhidhamma texts (As 9,20–22). This, of course, does not concur with the historical development.

**155.** Traditionally, it is assumed that the Tikas and Dukas just mentioned were spoken by the Buddha himself, while another 42 Dukas have been added by Sāriputta (As 9,23–26). It has been recognized by the tradition that the basis of Paṭṭh are DN no. 33 Saṅgīti- and no. 34 Dasuttara-Suttanta, together with AN. The text is thought to facilitate the use of the Suttantas for Abhidhamma specialists (As 9,27–29) and this is the purpose usually ascribed to Paṭṭh by the tradition.

The Paṭṭh tries to provide a comprehensive explanation of causality and enumerates what can originate out of what. It is easy to see that the number of possibilities that opens up here is almost limitless.

The structure of Paṭṭh is difficult to follow and has not been investigated sufficiently so far.

### III. The Paracanonical Texts

**156.** The Khuddakanikāya always remained open for additions (§ 119, 151), and according to paragraphs 38–41 in the Piṭakat samuiṇ (§ 4) four texts have been added to the Khuddakanikāya in Burma: Suttasamgaha, Nettippakaraṇa, Peṭakopadesa and Milindapañha<sup>260</sup>. The first one is a selection of texts mainly from the Tipiṭaka; Nett and Peṭ are handbooks for the interpretation of the Theravāda canon, and Mil is a dialogue. The last three texts may have belonged to a non-Theravāda tradition originally.

#### III.1 Suttasamgaha

**Suttasamgaha (Suttas: 2.9.2):** Edition: Suttasamgaha Ed. by R. Chaudhuri and D. Guha. Calcutta 1957. Bibliotheca Indica WN 282/IN 1575.

Commentary: **Suttasaṅgahaṭṭhakathā (Suttas-a : 2.9.2,1):** Ariyawansa Thera's Commentary on the Sutta Sangaha Revised and Edited by Baddegama Piyaratana and Kahawe Siri Sumangala Ratanasara. Colombo 1929. SHB XXV.

**157.** Although the Suttas is named in the Piṭakat samuiṇ as a paracanonical text, it has not been included into the Burmese Chaṭṭasaṅgāyana edition (§ 5), perhaps because Suttas contains also excerpts from the Aṭṭhakathā, e.g. III.3 Revatīvimanāvaṇṇanā (= Vv-a 220,1–229,12<sup>261</sup>).

<sup>260</sup> It has been stressed by Duroiselle 1911: 120 sq. that even in Burma these texts have not been incorporated in but were instead added to the Khuddakanikāya, cf. Collins 1992: 108. — Here the sequence of the Piṭakat samuiṇ has been followed in contrast to CPD (Epil.).

<sup>261</sup> The arrangement of the text in Suttas is slightly different from Vv-a, and the explanation of individual words from Vv is missing.

According to the introduction, Suttas has been compiled for practical purposes. It is arranged according to topics: I. Dānakathā “texts on donation” etc. Neither date nor author<sup>262</sup> are known. The only clue to a date is the quotation from the Vimānavatthu commentary<sup>263</sup>.

Suttas-a is quoted in Upās (Upās p. 122), composed before 1200 (§ 386).

### III.2 Nettippakaraṇa

**Nettippakaraṇa (Nett: 2.7.2):** Edition: E. Hardy 1902 (With Extracts from Dhammapāla’s commentary)<sup>264</sup>; translation: The Guide (Nettippakaraṇa) According to Kaccāna Thera Translated by Ñāṇamoli. London 1962.

Commentaries: Nettiaṭṭhakathā (§ 362); Līnatthavaṇṇanā (§ 363); Nettivibhāvanī (§381); Peṭakālaṃkāra (Nett-mhṭ) (§ 382).

**158.** This important handbook has not found the attention it deserves so far: “Of all the works ... in early Pāli literature, the Netti-Pakaraṇa is probably one of the least read and least understood”<sup>265</sup>. The understanding of Nett is indeed difficult in spite of the excellent and ground breaking translation by Ñāṇamoli.

The word *netti*, which occurs already in canonical Pāli, and means “guide”. The text, it seems, was composed with the purpose of systematically developing methods for an interpretation of the Tipiṭaka. Thus it may be a manual for commentators, although the possible influence of Nett on the composition of the Aṭṭhakathā has not been sufficiently investigated<sup>266</sup>.

**159.** The commentary on Nett<sup>267</sup> divides the text into two parts: *saṃgaḥa* “summary” (Nett 1,4\*-13\*) and *vibhāga* “explanation” (Nett 1,17–

<sup>262</sup> Suttas p. XII: “compiled at Anuradhapura ... by ... Ariyavaṃsa”: The source of this statement is not given.

<sup>263</sup> The supposed quotation from Pālim found in Suttas: Suttas p. XII sq. is indeed a quotation from Sp 788,30 sq. in Pālim. Consequently, it has no bearing on the date.

<sup>264</sup> A *Nettipakaraṇapaṇṭhi* (Nett-gp: 2.7.2,01) is quoted in Mañis (§ 347).

<sup>265</sup> Bond 1979: 29; Bond 1980 is a slightly revised version of Bond 1979; both are preliminary studies for Bond 1982.

<sup>266</sup> In spite of the very valuable notes in Nett-trsl p. LIII sq.

<sup>267</sup> Quoted Nett 194, note 1.

193,2). The extremely brief first part comprises only five verses, which mention the name Mahākaccāna<sup>268</sup>, who is traditionally assumed to be the author of Nett.

The *vibhāga* is divided into three subsections: The first subsection is named *uddesavāra* “specification section” (Nett 1,17–3,4) in some manuscripts and in the commentary. It enumerates the 16 *hāras* “modes of conveying<sup>269</sup>”, the five *nayas* “guide-lines”, and the 18 *mūlapadas* “root-terms” and is, at the same time, a kind of short commentary on the *samgahavāra*. The next subsection called *niddesavāra* “demonstrative subsection” (Nett 3,8–5,7) again gives the *hāras* and the *nayas*, followed by a new group of the 12 *padas* “terms”, of which six refer to the linguistic form (*vyañjana*) and six to the meaning (*attha*). This last group at the same time constitutes a *sutta* “thread” comprising “the entire utterance of the Buddha<sup>270</sup>”. The final verses of the *niddesavāra* combine these different groups explaining how *naya* and *pada* relate to *attha* etc.

160. After this skeleton of Nett has been described, the section called *paṭiniddesa* “counter-demonstrative subsection” (Nett 5,14–193,2) in the commentary begins, which forms the main body of the text. It is subdivided into three parts. First, in the *hāravibhaṅga* “separate treatment of the modes of conveying” (Nett 5,14–84,28), the 16 *hāras* are dealt with in such a way that the respective verse from the *niddesavāra* is quoted and illustrated by examples drawn from the Suttapiṭaka. At the end it is stated: “this is why the venerable Mahākaccāna said ...”, followed by the verse under discussion.

The way in which the name Mahākaccāna is mentioned does not necessarily point to him as the author of the *kārikās*, much less of the whole Nett<sup>271</sup>.

161. Only the first subsection of the following chapter, called *hārasampāta* “combined treatment of modes of conveying” (Nett 85,4–109,18), is built in the same way as the *hāravibhaṅga*. The base is *niddesavāra* verse 22 (Nett 4,26\* sq.), in which all 16 *hāras* are combined with three *nayas*. While in the *hāravibhaṅga* all 16 *hāras* have

<sup>268</sup> Following the Theravāda tradition, he is identical with the disciple of the Buddha.

<sup>269</sup> These are the translations by Ñāṇamoli.

<sup>270</sup> Cf. Nett-trsl p. 3: 1/2 on the difficult term *sutta* in Nett.

<sup>271</sup> Cf. Wezler 1993: 110 with note 23.



been illustrated by different examples from the Suttantas, the *hārasam-pāta* applies all 16 *hāras* to a single verse: Ud 38,6\*-10\* (cf. § 169).

162. The third part, the *nayasamuṭṭhāna* “moulding of the guide-lines” (Nett 109,22–127,23) is divided into five *bhūmis* “planes” (cf. § 167) and based on the verses 17–21 of the *niddesavāra* (Nett 4,16\*-25\*). Astonishingly, the sequence of the *nayas* in these verses is not the same as in the *nayasamuṭṭhāna*.

163. The *sāsanapaṭṭhāna* “pattern of dispensation” (Nett 127,27–193,2) deals with the *mūlapadas* in very loose connection to the *nidesavāra*, for the *mūlapadas* found here are different from those named at the beginning of Nett. They are simply illustrated by quotations from the Tipiṭaka without any further explanation.

164. At the very end of Nett, the third verse of the *uddesavāra*, containing the name Mahākaccāna, is quoted, and it is said that after he had spoken the text of Nett, the Buddha had approved it, and that it had been recited at the first council (*mūlasaṃgīti*) (Nett 193,1 sq.). This date is certainly by far too early, although the only hint to the time when Nett might have been composed is a quotation in the Aṭṭhaka-thā<sup>272</sup>.

It is important for dating Nett that the introductory verses have been written in the *āryā*-metre, which was not in use in Ceylon before Buddhaghosa<sup>273</sup>. This seems to indicate that at least these verses have been composed at an early date on the continent and that the text may have grown over a considerable period.

As the main text of Nett is a commentary on the introductory verses, these may be called *kārikās* “summary verses”, and thus the literary form of Nett can be connected to the mainstream of Indian philosophical literature, where *kārikās* became popular during the first centuries AD<sup>274</sup>. However, this does not prove to be helpful for dating Nett because *kārikās* in *śloka*- and *āryā*-metres are found already in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya<sup>275</sup> (ca. 150 BC?).

<sup>272</sup> Ps I 31,7 etc., cf. Nett-trsl p. XIII note 18. On the date of Nett cf. also Rhys Davids 1925 and Lamotte 1958/1988: 357/325.

<sup>273</sup> The importance of this metre has been observed already by E. Hardy, Nett p. XXII sq.; cf. Alsdorf 1965: 71.

<sup>274</sup> Frauwallner 1953: 279, cf. Winternitz 1920: 422.

<sup>275</sup> Kielhorn 1886/1969: 228–233/214–219.

The use of *kārikās* and their metre seem to point to North India, perhaps even to Ujjain, for a Buddhist tradition connects the name of Mahā-Kaccāna, the assumed author of Nett, to Avanti the very region from which the Pāli texts are supposed to have been brought to Ceylon<sup>276</sup>.

165. In this connection it is important to point out that there are quotations in Nett from sources untraced so far besides those from the Theravāda Tipiṭaka<sup>277</sup>. Some verses have been traced in the meantime to a Mūlasarvāstivāda text<sup>278</sup>, which shows that Nett is not based exclusively on the Theravāda tradition, which agrees with the conclusions to be drawn from the literary form of Nett, which is quite unusual in Pāli literature.

166. Finally, it may be interesting to note a certain, though loose, connection between Nett and the Parivāra (§ 40–42): both texts are divided into *vāras*, and Nett uses (*naya*) *samuṭṭhāna*, which is a Vinaya term<sup>279</sup>. Just as the Parivāra gives a summary of the Vinaya for practical purposes, Nett can be considered a Suttanta handbook.

### III.3 Peṭakopadesa

**Peṭakopadesa (Peṭ: 2.7.1):** Edition: The Peṭakopadesa ed. by A.Barua. Revised Edition with an Index by H.Kopp. London 1982; translation: The Piṭaka-Disclosure (Peṭakopadesa) According to Kaccāna Thera Translated by Ñānamoli. London 1964.

Commentary: cf. Peṭ-trsl. p. XXXIV.

167. The text tradition of Peṭ, which is not protected by any old commentary<sup>280</sup>, is particularly bad, and all manuscripts can be traced back to one corrupt ancestor<sup>281</sup>.

<sup>276</sup> Lamotte 1958/1988: 207/189, 357/325

<sup>277</sup> Quotations have been collected in Nett-trsl p. 283–287, though unfortunately Ñānamoli did not distinguish between parallels and true quotations.

<sup>278</sup> Bechert 1961: 32, 81: verse 58 (p. 107) and 66 (p. 112).

<sup>279</sup> v.Hinüber 1992.

<sup>280</sup> There is a commentary written in this century: Peṭ-trsl p. XXXIV, cf. Nett-trsl p. XIV note 20; cf. Bollée 1968: 316.

<sup>281</sup> Peṭ-trsl p. XIX § 7.

It seems that Nett and Peṭ deal with the same subject matter, although this has never been thoroughly checked. A concordance between both texts is a desideratum.

The arrangement of the text in Peṭ is quite different from Nett. The eight chapters are called *bhūmis* “planes”, which is singular in Pāli literature (but cf. § 162). Differently from Nett, Peṭ does not begin with *kārikās*, but with an unusual benediction: *namo sammāsambuddhānaṃ paramatthadassīnaṃ sīlādiguṇapāramippattānaṃ* “homage to the Fully Enlightened Ones, who see the ultimate meaning, who have reached perfection in the qualities beginning with virtue” (Ñāṇamoli).

168. Because of the similarity of contents, the relation between Nett and Peṭ has been discussed more than once. According to E.Hardy and followed by L.Alsdorf<sup>282</sup>, Nett is the older, and Peṭ the younger text. This has been challenged by Ñāṇamoli on the rather general grounds that the text of Nett is much better organized than is Peṭ<sup>283</sup>.

An important and perhaps conclusive point in this respect is the occurrence of the same *āryā*-verses in both texts. As these verses are well arranged at the beginning of Nett, but in Peṭ dispersed all over the text, it appears that they have been taken over and rearranged by Peṭ, where the *āryās* are, moreover, often very badly preserved.

169. Although the profile of quotations is almost identical in both texts, there are only very few quotations common to both<sup>284</sup>. Further, Peṭ sometimes also gives the source of a text quoted in a somewhat peculiar way: Ekuttarīke, Peṭ 6,24 etc., Saṃyuttake, Peṭ 9,17 etc., but also Ekādaśaṅguttareṣu, Peṭ 15,19. As the Milindapañha refers to texts quoted in a similar way, H.Bechert has concluded that Peṭ, like Mil, intruded into the Theravāda tradition from outside<sup>285</sup>.

Perhaps Nett and Peṭ are not directly dependent on each other, but simply dealing with the same material derived from a common source used for the same purpose. This would explain, e.g., why Peṭ uses Dhṛp 1 (Peṭ 163,2\*) to illustrate the *hārasampāta*, Peṭ 141,3–241,31, while Nett has Ud 38,6\*–10\* (§ 161), for it is difficult to see, why these verses should have been exchanged, if Nett was developed

<sup>282</sup> Nett p. XIX sq., cf. Alsdorf 1965: 72.

<sup>283</sup> Nett-trsl p. XXV, cf. Norman 1983: 108.

<sup>284</sup> The quotations in Peṭ have been collected in Peṭ-trsl p. 381–385.

<sup>285</sup> Bechert 1955/1957: 352 sq.

out of Peṭ. Further, there are differences in terminology, e.g., *anugīti*, Nett 2,11 corresponds to *uddānagāthā*, Peṭ 3,19<sup>286</sup> etc.

**170.** Peṭ is ascribed to Mahākaccāna much more explicitly than Nett, for his name and title *suttavebhaṅgin* “moulder of guide-lines” (Ñāṇamoli)<sup>287</sup> is mentioned in the colophons to several *bhūmis*. Even the name of the monastery where he is supposed to have stayed is communicated as Jambūvana, Peṭ 260,15<sup>288</sup>.

**171.** A text ascribed to Mahākātyāyana called Pi-lê in Chinese, corresponding to “Peṭaka”, is mentioned by Kumārajīva (5th century) as being used in South India in his translation of Nāgārjuna’s Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra<sup>289</sup>. This could refer to Peṭ, if there were not quotations from a “Peṭaka” in Pāli literature, which cannot be traced to Peṭ<sup>290</sup>. Thus it is not impossible that there was even a third text similar to Peṭ and Nett. At present this problem cannot be solved.

It seems, however, likely that Nett and Peṭ intruded from outside into the Theravāda as handbooks to understand and to explain the Suttantas. As such, they could be compared to Nidd, Paṭis and to the later Visuddhimagga.

### III.4 Milindapañha

**Milindapañha (Mil: 2.6):** Edition: V.Trenckner 1880 (with indices 1928); translations: T.W.Rhys Davids, SBE XXV, XXVI (1890, 1894); I.B.Horner: *Milinda’s Questions*. London I–II (1963, 1964); Nyanatiloka: *Die Fragen des Königs Milinda*, teilweise neu übersetzt von Nyanaponika mit einer Einleitung von H.Bechert. Interlaken 1985; *Voprosy Milindy (Milindapancha)*. Perevod s Pali ... A.V.Paribka. Moscow

<sup>286</sup> It has escaped the attention of the CPD that *uddānagāthā* is used Peṭ 12,1 in an unusual sense not summing up the contents of the preceding text, but the canonical passages quoted: Peṭ 6,22; 6,24; 7,3 etc.

<sup>287</sup> It has been recognized by Ñāṇamoli that this is not the title of the last chapter, as assumed in all editions: Peṭ-trsl § 1041/1.

<sup>288</sup> This name does not seem to be attested to elsewhere.

<sup>289</sup> Lamotte 1958/1988: 208/189, cf. Lamotte 1949a: 109 note 2; 113 sq. and Bapat 1937: XLII sq.

<sup>290</sup> Peṭ-trsl p. 398–402, cf. § 362.

1989 (Bibliotheca Buddhica XXXVI); Entretiens de Milinda et Nāgasena traduit ... par É.Nolot. Paris 1995.

Commentary: *Milindañikā* ([Mil-†: 2.6,1]): Edited by P.S.Jaini. London 1961. – Survey of literature on Mil: O.v. Hinüber: The Oldest dated Manuscript of the Mil. JPTS 11. 1987, 111–119; JPTS 12. 1989, 173 sq.; cf. E.Guillon: Les questions de Milinda. Un roi gréco-indien dans un texte môn. Cahiers de l'Asie du Sud-Est. 29/30. 1991, 75–92.

172. Mil is a dialogue between the Indo-Greek king Menandros (2nd century BC) and the otherwise unknown Buddhist monk Nāgasena about problems of the Dhamma.

Although Menandros is a historical personality, Mil is an ahistorical text<sup>291</sup>: Milinda talks to the six heretics, who were contemporaries of the Buddha (!) (Mil 4,15–5,21). And although Milinda is Greek, there is no traceable Greek influence on form or content of the purely Indic dialogue<sup>292</sup>, derived from Upaniṣadic traditions.

173. The development of Mil can be traced with the help of a fourth century Chinese translation called \*Nāgasenabhikṣusūtra, which is extant, while an earlier one dating from the third century (?) is lost<sup>293</sup>. By comparing the Chinese translation, it can be inferred that the original Mil was much shorter and written in a language different from Pāli, perhaps Gāndhārī, a northwestern Middle Indic<sup>294</sup>, which would also account for some peculiarities of concepts, e.g., eight *mahāvīlakaṇa*, Mil 193,27 “great investigations (of a Bodhisatta before his last rebirth)” instead of five in the Nidānakathā (Ja I 48,24 ≠ As 33,15), or the vocabulary used in Mil.

Moreover, Mil is quoted in the old Aṭṭhakathā (§ 317).

174. ~~Mil begins with a formula unusual in Pāli: *taṃyathā 'nusūyate ...*~~, Mil 1,13 “thus it hath been handed down by tradition (Rhys Davids)”. Equally unusual is the fact that a table of contents is given at Mil 2,16–22, which, however, does not correspond to the actual contents in every detail.

<sup>291</sup> This is stressed by Fussman 1993 in his fundamental article on the Greek king Menandros.

<sup>292</sup> Greek influence has been postulated frequently, erroneously, cf. Vasil'kov 1993 together with the earlier version Vasil'kov 1989.

<sup>293</sup> Cf. the ground breaking article by Demiéville 1924.

<sup>294</sup> Fussman 1993: 66.

175. The original Mil contained the *Pubbayoga* (Mil 2,23–24,26<sup>295</sup>), seven Vaggas “sections” (Mil 25,1–87,19) and a brief conclusion (Mil 87,21–89,16), at the end of which it is said: “the answers to Milinda’s questions are concluded” (Mil 89,17)<sup>296</sup>.

Questions and answers in the separate paragraphs of this part of Mil are formalized in a particular way beginning with *rājā āha* “the king says” and ending in *kallo ‘si bhante Nāgasena* “you are dexterous, revered Nāgasena” (I.B.Horner).

The conversation ends in the evening of the second day (Mil 87,23), after Milinda had paid a visit to Nāgasena, who is introduced in a lengthy section (Mil 7,4–22,17) during the previous day (Mil 29,19–23). When Nāgasena’s learning is praised, the Tipiṭaka and its parts are enumerated for the first time in Pāli literature (§ 11).

In the morning of the third day both meet again to assure each other of their mutual respect. The original Mil ends with a formula modelled after the end of Suttantas in MN which are not spoken by the Buddha<sup>297</sup>. This sentence, perhaps typical for Theravāda Buddhism, is missing in the Chinese version.

176. The second part of Mil, which is alien to the Chinese text, is called *Meṇḍakapañha* (Mil 90,1–328,16) “question about the ram<sup>298</sup>” containing eight Vaggas and beginning like a new text with introductory verses.

In the morning of the fourth day Milinda visits Nāgasena again this time alone in sharp contrast to the first part, where he is accompanied by a large entourage. Moreover, he wants to talk to Nāgasena alone in a secret place, and he promises to keep the contents of their conversation secret (Mil 91,23; 93,29). The form of the questions and answers is different, too: Milinda addresses the monk by *bhante Nāgasena* in the questions and he often concurs by (*evaṃ etaṃ*) *tathā sampañicchāmi*, Mil 119,9 sq. “it is so, I agree”. Frequently Nāgasena quotes from canonical texts to support his argument (cf. § 179).

177. The third part, which is not subdivided, is called *Anumānapañha* (Mil 329,1–347,29) “Questions (on points) to be inferred”. Without

<sup>295</sup> The section is called *bāhirakathā*, Mil 24,27, but *pubbayoga*, Mil 1,18.

<sup>296</sup> Similarly the end of a part of the *Parivāra* is indicated, cf. § 41.

<sup>297</sup> Mil-trsl. I.B.Horner I, p. 124 note 1; e.g. MN I 32,33 sq. = Mil 89,15.

<sup>298</sup> That is, difficult questions. The title alludes to a *Jātaka*: PED s.v.

having separated, both men meet again to discuss the Buddha as a single topic. Again, the form differs from both the preceding sections.

The next part continues the *Meṇḍakapañha* as *Vagga* nine (Mil 348,1–362,9), also dealing with only one topic: the possibility of laymen to attain *nibbāna* and, if this is possible, whether there is any value in the *dhutagaṇas* “ascetic qualities”.

178. The last part is subdivided into six *Vaggas* and called *Opammakathāpañha* “questions discussed (by the help of) comparisons” (Mil 363,1–420,22). Again, a new form of a text is met with: it begins with a question similar to those found in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*: “Provided by which attributes is it possible for a monk to reach *nibbāna*?” Then follows a paragraph called *mātikā*, although it is built from complete sentences and not from single words (cf. § 131), and enumerates 84 comparisons to be discussed (Mil 363,2–365,19).

At the end of the individual paragraphs Nāgasena quotes verses spoken by the Buddha or by Theras, some of which are found in the Theragāthā (§ 105). Consequently, this part again shows a structure different from all preceding ones.

In the extant text only 58 out of these 84 comparisons are actually dealt with, which shows that at the end a considerable portion of the text has been lost. Thus Mil is the only Pāli text which has been handed down in an incomplete form, found already in the oldest manuscript that was copied AD 1495.

179. Summing up, it can be said that Mil is a collection of the following texts kept together only by the persons of the interlocutors<sup>299</sup>:

- I. The original Mil: Mil 2,23–89,16
- II. *Meṇḍakapañha* (A): 90,1–328,16
- III. *Anumānapañha*: 329,1–347,20
- IV. *Meṇḍakapañha* (B): 348,1–362,27
- V. *Opammakathāpañha*: 363,1–420,22

The growth of Mil can be traced very roughly. The Chinese version contains only Mil I, which should have been composed between 100 BC and 200 AD. The remaining four parts existed at the time of

<sup>299</sup> On the structure of Mil cf. also Schrader 1905: XXIII–XXXIII.

the *Aṭṭhakathā*, which quote also from *Mil* II–V<sup>300</sup>. It is of particular interest that the *Vinaya* commentary states that in the “*Meṇḍaka-Milindapañha*” only those passages adduced by *Nāgasena* to instruct *Milinda* are canonical (cf. § 437), the rest is “his opinion” (cf. § 176 note 723).

**180.** The *Milindaṭṭhā* (*Mil-ṭ*: [2.6,1]) or *Madhuratthappakāsinī* (*Mil-ṭ* p. VII) by *Mahātipiṭaka Cūlābhayaṭṭhara* has probably been composed in AD 1474 perhaps in *Chiang Mai*. It offers hardly any help for understanding *Mil*<sup>301</sup>. A modern commentary written in *Burma* is described by *Deshpande* 1984<sup>302</sup>.

---

<sup>300</sup> On quotations from *Mil*: *Mil-trsl* I.B.Horner I, p. X sq.; *Mil-trsl* Rhys Davids I, p. XIV, and on quotations found in *Mil*: *Mil-trsl* Rhys Davids I, p. XXVII.

<sup>301</sup> Cf. the pertinent discussions by P.S.Jaini, *Mil-ṭ*: Introduction.

<sup>302</sup> This commentary had been described earlier in *Bollée* 1968: 315 sq.



## IV. The Chronicles

**181.** The history of Ceylon is better known than that of many parts of the Indian subcontinent because of the Buddhist chronicles composed on the island. A survey of the historical research based on the chronicles is found in Perera 1979; the cultural data have been collected by Geiger 1960/1986.

The reasons why historiography rarely found elsewhere in Indian literature developed on the island has been discussed by Bechert 1969 and 1972, cf. also Cort 1995.

In addition to the chronicles, there is a rich hagiographical literature. These texts are also called *-vamsa* "genealogy", though dealing with the history of Stūpas or relics<sup>303</sup>. Others contain prophecies about the future.

### IV.1 Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa

**Dīpavaṃsa (Dīp: 4.1.1):** Editions: H.Oldenberg 1879 (with translation); The Chronicle of the island of Ceylon or Dīpavaṃsa ... Edited ... by B.C.Law, in: The Ceylon Historical Journal 7.1957/8<sup>304</sup>.

**Mahāvaṃsa (Mhv: 4.1.2):** Editions: Mahāvaṃsa Ed. by W.Geiger 1908; Cūḷavaṃsa Ed. by W.Geiger I (1925), II (1927); translations: W.Geiger: The Mahāvaṃsa. 1912 (Reprinted with an "Addendum" by G.C.Mendis. Colombo 1950); A.W.P.Guruge: Mahāvaṃsa the Great Chronicle of Sri Lanka ... An Annotated New Translation ... Colombo 1989. [rev.: H.Bechert, ZDMG 143.1993, 216–218] (the translation

---

<sup>303</sup> On *vamsa*-literature cf. also Collins 1990: 99 sq.; for a bibliography of texts published in Ceylon: Kitsudo 1970. – Gandhavaṃsa and Sāsanaṃvaṃsa have been dealt with in § 4; on the Thai chronicles: § 425–429.

<sup>304</sup> This edition is entirely based on Oldenberg. On the indepent C<sup>e</sup> 1927 and B<sup>e</sup> 1929: Bechert 1986: 147 [21].

without the appendices appeared also in Calcutta 1990); Cūlavamsa Trsl. by W.Geiger I (1929), II (1930)<sup>305</sup>.

Commentary: **Vamsatthappakāsinī** (Mhv-ṭ: 4.1.2,1): Edition: G.P.Malalasekera, I, II (1935).

**182.** The content of both chronicles is largely the same. It has been described in Geiger 1901/1973: 4–7/236–239 for the shorter Dīp, and in Geiger 1901/1973: 13sq./245sq. for the longer Mhv, which is indeed an enlarged version of Dīp. A concordance of both texts is given by Geiger 1905: 120–146<sup>306</sup>. The Cūlavamsa is a continuation of and forms a unit with Mhv.

Both chronicles use the historical introduction to the Sīhaḷaṭṭhaka-thā (§ 206, 212), both relate the history of Ceylon from a Buddhist point of view and contain valuable information also on the history of Pāli literature, e.g., on the second council (Dīp IV 47–V 54 = Mhv IV 1–V 13), on the writing down of the Theravāda canon during the 1st century BC (Dīp XX 20 = Mhv XXXIII 100sq.)<sup>307</sup> or on the recitation of Pāli texts on certain occasions (cf. § 58, 109). The history begins with the mythical past ending with the reign of King Mahāsena (334–362<sup>308</sup>).

The Cūlavamsa continues up to AD 1815<sup>309</sup>:

Mahāvamsa: Mahānāma: I 1–XXXVII 50

- Cūlavamsa:
- I. Dhammakitti: XXXVII 51–LXXXIX 84 up to Parakkamabāhu I. (1153–1186)
  - II. Anonymous: LXXXIX 85–XC 102 up to Parakkamabāhu IV. (1302–1332)
  - III A. Tibboṭuvāve Sumaṅgala: XC 105–C 301 up to Kittisirirājasīha (1746–1781)
  - III B. Hikkaduve Sṛi Sumaṅgala and Baṭuvantudave Paṇḍita: CI 1–29 up to 1815

<sup>305</sup> Cf. also Kitsudo 1970: 71 sq.

<sup>306</sup> Geiger's studies on the chronicles have been collected for the better part in Geiger 1973.

<sup>307</sup> Bechert 1992b.

<sup>308</sup> Or: 274–302: Bechert in Geiger 1986: XX sq., but cf. R.Gombrich, OLZ 1990, 83sq. In the following both dates are given.

<sup>309</sup> Geiger 1929/1973: 260/274.

At the end it is said: *ingirīsanāmakā sabbaṃ rajjaṃ karagataṃ karuṃ*, Mhv CI 29 “the Ingirīsi (English) by name seized the whole kingdom” (Geiger). The authors of the (for the present) very last chapter are at the same time the editors of the first Ceylonese print in 1877<sup>310</sup>.

**183. Dīpavaṃsa** “Chronicle of the Island” has been handed down anonymously. No commentary survives, though a Dīpavaṃsaṭṭhaka-thā is mentioned in the Mhv-Commentary<sup>311</sup>.

Dīp has been used in the historical introduction to the Samantapāsādikā (§ 212)<sup>312</sup> and is quoted in the commentary on the Kathāvatthu (§ 322). As the relation ends during the 4th century AD, it is likely that Dīp has been composed not long after 350 AD. Consequently, Dīp seems to be the first Pāli text known to have been composed in Ceylon. This is probably the reason for a certain awkwardness of formulation and style. Even the grammatical construction of quite a few verses is difficult, often due to the fact that parts of verses or formulas have been put together rather mechanically<sup>313</sup>.

Some verses of Dīp (e.g. Dīp XVII 3) are simple enumerations, others can be understood only by comparing the corresponding parts of Mhv. Therefore, it seems that Dīp always needed some accompanying explanation in a similar way as an *ākhyāna* (cf. § 113)<sup>314</sup>. The verses in *śloka*- or *jagatī*-metres are occasionally interrupted by prose passages such as Dīp IV 47 quoting Vin II 294,5–8.

The 22 chapters are called *bhāṇavāra* “section for recitation”. Rare intermediate titles refer to the contents such *ācariyavāda*, Dīp V 54 at the end of the enumeration of Buddhist schools. These titles are not found after the end of chapter XVIII, which marks the end of the Mahāvāra (cf. § 186).

**184.** The sources of Dīp have been discussed by Geiger 1905, who has drawn attention to those passages, in which the same events are related twice, as e.g., the first council at Dīp IV 1–26 and at V 1–15. Some-

<sup>310</sup> The Mhv is the first long Pāli text ever printed in Roman characters in the edition by George Turnour (1799–1843), which appeared in Colombo 1837.

<sup>311</sup> Mhv-ṭ p. LXVIII.

<sup>312</sup> Norman 1983: 116 sq.

<sup>313</sup> Franke 1907 and § 206, cf., however, the important observations in Tsuchida 1987.

<sup>314</sup> Geiger 1905: 28.

times material contained in these reduplications and ascribed to the Uttaravihāra, which is identical with the Abhayagirivihāra (cf. § 43)<sup>315</sup>, has been suppressed in Mhv (cf. § 187)<sup>316</sup>.

Geiger's researches have been continued by Frauwallner<sup>317</sup>, who was able to demonstrate that Dīp used two separate sources, the first being a history of the Buddhist community and the second a secular chronicle (*rājavaṃsa*). Both the chronicles and the history of Buddhism are again divided into an older and a younger part, each composed in India and in Ceylon respectively. Dīp as analysed by Frauwallner gives an account on the following four topics:

- I. The visits of the Buddha to Ceylon
- II. History of the kings (*rājavaṃsa*)
- III. History of the Buddhist community beginning from the first council and containing the names of prominent monks and nuns of Ceylon
- IV. Chronicle of events in Ceylon beginning with the advent of Vijaya and ending with king Mahāsena<sup>318</sup>

These are indeed the topics mentioned in the introduction: *dīpāga-manam Buddhassa*, Dīp I 1 (= I.); *sasanāgamanam*, Dīp I 1 (= III.); *narindāgamanam*, Dīp I 1 (= IV.); *vaṃsa*, Dīp I 4 (= II.).

The different sources are only loosely knit together in Dīp, and therefore easily recognized and separated. Any literary pretensions are missing. Dīp still belongs to the earlier *ākhyāna* tradition (cf. § 183), and only Mhv may be called a true epic.

**185.** The title *Mahāvamsa* "Great Chronicle" is found in the introduction to the text (Mhv I 1). A second title is used in the commentary: *Padyapadoruvamsagāthā* (§ 188).

The author of Mhv is a certain Mahānāma from the monastery of the general Dīghasanda, according to the commentary (Mhv-ṭ 687,4). Nothing else is known about him, and any possible identification with other persons bearing this rather common name is speculative<sup>319</sup>.

<sup>315</sup> Geiger 1905: 73–76.

<sup>316</sup> Frauwallner 1984: 20.

<sup>317</sup> Frauwallner 1984.

<sup>318</sup> Frauwallner 1984: 24.

<sup>319</sup> Paranavitana 1962 with fanciful and untenable conclusions.

It seems that Mahānāma lived later than Buddhaghosa (§ 207), because he may have been able to polish his style by studying the “new” Aṭṭhakathā. Following Geiger, he mastered his task “not as a genius but with taste and skill<sup>320</sup>”. If this is correct, he might have lived at the end of the 5th century, so that Mhv is written about a century later than Dīp<sup>321</sup>.

Although Mhv covers the same period, it is more than twice as long as Dīp, containing 2904<sup>322</sup>, against 1347, verses. The end of 35 out of 36 Pariccheda “sections” is marked by verse in an elaborate metre in contrast to the usual *śloka*.

In the introduction, Mahānāma says that he tries to avoid mistakes made by his predecessors, such as being too verbose, too short or repetetive, which could be remarks aimed at Dīp (cf. § 184), if not to a predecessor of Mhv written in Sinhalese, the Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathāmahāvaṃsa, Mhv-ṭ 47,25–32.

**186.** While only 13 verses of Dīp are devoted to King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (101–77 BC/161–137) (cf. § 192) and his victorious war against the Tamil King Elāra, Mhv describes these events at great length in 861 verses (Mhv XXII–XXXII), what seems to be a popular epic integrated into Mhv<sup>323</sup> at the very point where the Mahāvāra-section of Dīp ends (cf. § 183).

Often Mhv does not repeat those passages belonging to the Abhayagirivihāra tradition (cf. § 184). Thus Mhv is much more a true Mahāvihāra text than Dīp. At the end of Mhv, the reestablishment of that monastery is described after it had been suppressed and deserted under King Mahāsena.

**187.** The continuation of Mhv (cf. § 182) is commonly known as Cūḷavaṃsa in Ceylon, although the manuscripts do not support this<sup>324</sup>.

According to Geiger, the first extension of Mhv is based on a chronicle of Rohaṇa, the southern part of Ceylon, and on annals<sup>325</sup>.

<sup>320</sup> Geiger 1901/1973: 24/256.

<sup>321</sup> Geiger 1905: 46 and Cūḷavaṃsa-trsl note on Mhv XXXIX 42; but cf. Frauwallner 1984: 9 “by order of Dhātusena (516–526)”.

<sup>322</sup> This is called 12 *bhāṇavāras* Mhv-ṭ 12,18, which, however, should contain 3000 verses.

<sup>323</sup> Geiger 1901/1973: 14 sq./246 sq.

<sup>324</sup> Cūḷavaṃsa ed. Geiger p. I, cf. *mahāvaṃsamhi... cūḷavaṃse*, Mhv XCIX 76.

<sup>325</sup> Geiger 1929/1973: 263–265/277–279.

Further, *puññapotthakas* “merit books” of the kings have been used, which enumerate donations<sup>326</sup>. Facts communicated here can be checked against the evidence of the inscriptions.

**188. Mhv-ṭ**, the “(Commentary) Explaining the Meaning of the Chronicle” is planned to comment on unclear words (*anuttānapadavaṇṇanā*, Mhv-ṭ 3,4) in Mhv<sup>327</sup>, which is also called Padyapadoruvaṃsa(gāthā) “(Verses) in the Long Chronicle in Verses” in Mhv-ṭ (Mhv-ṭ 3,4).

Mhv-ṭ frequently refers to the Aṭṭhakathā and occasionally even to the Aṭṭhakathā of the Uttaravihāra, which should be consulted for certain details (Mhv-ṭ 187,7). This is of particular interest, because Mhv itself tends to suppress material of the Uttaravihāra/Abhayagirivihāra (§ 184,186). Moreover, Vism (Mhv-ṭ 18,16) is referred to and Sp has been quoted<sup>328</sup>: Once the opinion of Sp is contrasted to that of the Mahāvamsaṭṭhakathā (Mhv-ṭ 207,16). This might prove the existence of a predecessor to Mhv-ṭ.

The information given in Mhv-ṭ is always useful. Many details are added to Mhv, such as the story of Sāliṛājakumāra (cf. § 410), or differences between the texts of the Mahā- and the Abhayagiri-vihāra are pointed out (Mhv-ṭ 175,31; 676–21, cf. § 43).

Mhv-ṭ has been composed before the first addition to Mhv was made by Dhammakitti in the 12th century (§ 182). Nothing else can be said about the date of Mhv-ṭ with any confidence, for it is impossible to draw any conclusions from a comparison of Mhv-ṭ as the only historical commentary to others commenting on religious texts.

Geiger<sup>329</sup> would assign the text to a time between AD 1000 and 1250, which Malalasekera tries to refute in his detailed and important introduction to Mhv-ṭ. He is inclined to think of the 8th/9th century<sup>330</sup>, which, though mostly accepted<sup>331</sup>, remains a mere guess.

## IV.2 The Extended Mahāvamsa

**[Extended Mahāvamsa (ExtMhv: 4.1.2.1)]:** Edition: Extended Mahāvamsa Edited by G.P.Malalasekera. Colombo 1937.

<sup>326</sup> Geiger 1929/1973: 267/281.

<sup>327</sup> Mhv-ṭ 12,15–20, where the division and the length of Mhv are given.

<sup>328</sup> On legal matters Mhv-ṭ 362,4 referring to Sp 1041,15–17.

<sup>329</sup> Geiger 1905: 36sq.

<sup>330</sup> Mhv-ṭ p. CIX.

<sup>331</sup> Rahula 1966: XXIV; Norman 1983: 139.

**189.** This text, which is called simply Mahāvamsa, without any qualification, and contains also 27 Paricchedas “Sections” has been composed by an otherwise unknown Moggallāna by using besides Mhv also the Buddhavaṃsa, Thūpavaṃsa and the Mahāvamsa commentary<sup>332</sup>, thus expanding the text to 5791 verses. To distinguish it from Mhv it is also sometimes called Kambodian Mhv, because all known manuscripts are written in this script.

Time and place of origin are uncertain. The text tradition restricted to SE Asia points to Burma or Thailand, and so do the verses of the Tittira-Jātaka (Ja no. 319), quoted in ExtMhv V 596–625, which follow the Burmese recension of the Jātaka<sup>333</sup>.

### IV.3 Vamsamālivilāsini

[Vamsamālivilāsini (Vamsam: 4.1.2.2)]: Edition: Balee Buddhakasa: Vamsamālinī. A Critical Study of Palm Leaf Texts. Thesis Benares 1991 (unpublished).

**190.** So far only 9 out of 13 Paricchedas have been edited<sup>334</sup>. The text, which covers the same period as Mhv, is an abbreviation (*sāṅkhepa*, Vamsam I 2), though with additional material, it seems, for according to the survey of contents, chapter 13 contains sections called Milinda-pañha and Buddhaghosaniḍānakathā<sup>335</sup>. The text is called Vamsamālinī in the colophon, but Vamsamālivilāsini in the titles of individual chapters.

### IV.4 Mahābodhivaṃsa

**Mahābodhivaṃsa (Mhvb: 4.1.3):** Edition: S.A.Strong 1891.

**191.** The “Story of the Great Bodhi (Tree)” relates the advent of the bodhi tree in Anurādhapura in 12 chapters beginning with the enlightenment. The second chapter, called Ānandabodhi, contains a version

<sup>332</sup> Geiger 1905: 31.

<sup>333</sup> v. Hinüber 1982b; cf. § 409 on the Asandhimittā.

<sup>334</sup> Cf. Hundius 1990: 130 sq. – The Vamsam mentioned by Finot 1917: 151 is a different text.

<sup>335</sup> Vamsam p. 385.

of the Kalingabodhi-Jātaka (Ja no. 479), which is slightly different from the one found in Ja<sup>336</sup>.

A Sinhalese commentary on Mhbv written at the end of the 12th century names a certain Upatissa as the author of Mhbv. This is at the same time the first reference to this otherwise undatable text, which is supposed to have been composed perhaps in the 10th century. A Mahābodhivamsakathā mentioned in the Mahāvamsa commentary (Mhv-ṭ 412,12) seems to refer to a lost text. The verse quoted is not included in Mhbv.

Mhbv is written in the style of ornate poetry (*kāvya*)<sup>337</sup>. According to the introduction, it has been translated from Sinhalese to make it accessible also outside Ceylon. Numerous commentaries and translations into Sinhalese prove its popularity<sup>338</sup>.

#### IV.5 Thūpavamsa

**Thūpavamsa (Thūp: 4.1.4):** Edition and translation: The Chronicle of the Thūpa and the Thūpavamsa Being a Translation and Edition of Vācissaratthera's Thūpavamsa by N.A.Jayawickrama. London 1971.

192. Vācissara (cf. § 339; 342) has composed this text in the second half of the 13th century from sources similar to those used by Mhbv (§ 191), perhaps also including ExtMhv (§ 189)<sup>339</sup>. The topic is the construction of the Mahāthūpa (= Ruvanvāli [or: -māli] "Sovanna-māli-thūpa"), built at Anurādhapura by king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (101–77/161–137 BC), who is the central person of the text (cf. § 186). The relic contained in this Stūpa is traced back to the division of relics after the *nibbāna*. Other buildings such as the Lohapasāda "brazen palace" are also mentioned.

#### IV.6 Dāṭhavamśa

**Dāṭhavamśa (Dāṭh: 4.1.5):** Edition: T.W.Rhys Davids and R.Morris, JPTS 1884; L.de Milloue: Le Dāṭhavamśa ou histoire de la dent

<sup>336</sup> Mbv 66,7–82,2 corresponds to Ja IV 228,4–236,18, cf. Malalasekera 1928: 158.

<sup>337</sup> The Pāli *kāvya*-tradition postulated by Warder 1981: 204 cannot be substantiated.

<sup>338</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 158; Mhbv is also discussed by Geiger 1905: 84–88.

<sup>339</sup> Thūp p. XXX. The introduction to Thūp contains an important study of the text, cf. also Geiger 1905: 92–98; Malalasekera 1928: 216–218.



relique du Bouddha. AMG 7.1884, 397–484; Dāṭhavam̐sa Edited and Translated by B.C.Law. Lahore 1925; translation: see Edition; P.Jayawardena: Der Kult der Zahnreliquie. Untersuchungen zur Frage der Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Buddhismus und Volkskultur Ceylons. Thesis Munich 1975 (translation of chapter V: p. 39–70).

193. The “History of the Tooth Relic” which is also called Dantadhātuvam̐sanā (Gv 72,5) has been written by Dhammakitti, who was a Rājaguru (Dāṭh 151,23) and a pupil of Sāriputta (§ 376) in the early 13th century at the suggestion of the general Parakkama, who is mentioned at Mhv LXXX 49 sq. Different ornate metres are used, and each of the five chapters is concluded by a special metre as in Mhv.

The text, which contains popular traditions on this relic<sup>340</sup>, is supposed to be translated from a Sinhalese original dating back to the time when the relic came to Ceylon during the reign of Kittisiri Meghavan̐sa (304–332/244–272)<sup>341</sup>.

#### IV.7 Naḷātadhātuvam̐sa

**Naḷātadhātuvam̐sa (4.1.6):** Edition: planned by J.Filliozat, cf. BEFEO 79.1992: 232.

194. The “Story of the Forehead Bone” seems to have been composed during the 10/11th centuries. The structure and arrangement of the material is similar to Mhbv (§ 191)<sup>342</sup>.

#### IV.8 Chakesadhātuvam̐sa

**Chakesadhātuvam̐sa (Cha-k: 4.1.7):** Edition: I.P.Minayeff, JPTS 1885.

195. The “Story of the Six Hair Relics<sup>343</sup>” has been edited from a single manuscript acquired by the editor from the last royal Burmese librarian.

<sup>340</sup> Geiger 1905: 90.

<sup>341</sup> G.Turnour, Mhv (1837) p. 241 note states that the text lost today still existed in his times, cf. Malalasekera 1928: 208 note 3. If true, this was the by far oldest Sinhalese text surviving (3th century!!).

<sup>342</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 255 sq.

<sup>343</sup> This text is different from the **Kesadhātuvam̐sa** mentioned Mhv XXXIX 49, cf. Cuḷavam̐sa-trsḷ *ad locum*. An otherwise unknown text called [A]ṭṭhakesadhātuvam̐sa

Six Arahants ask the Buddha for relics to be worshipped in Stūpas by people living far away from the Buddha. Thus Stūpas are constructed on each hair: the first Stūpa in heaven by the god Sakka, the second by Mañimekhalā etc. Merchants are mentioned as are Stūpas of sailors in the land of the Ḍāmilas. Therefore, Cha-k was perhaps written having seafaring travellers in mind.

As the text begins after an introductory verse with the formula *evaṃ me sutam* ... (§ 53) it seems to belong to the the class of apocryphal Suttantas (cf. § 436) rather than to the Vāṃsa literature.

#### IV.9 Hatthavanagallavihāravāṃsa

**Hatthavanagallavihāravāṃsa** (Att: 4.1.8): Editions: G.P.Malalasekera, IHQ 6.1930 (Supplement), 1–7 [only introduction and Att 1,4–7,9]; C.E. Godakumbura. London 1956; translation: J. d'Alwis: The Attanagaluvaṃsa or the History of the Temple of Attanagalla Translated from the Pāli with Notes and Annotations. Colombo 1866.

196. The text tells the story of Hatthavanagalla (Sgh. Attanagalu, ca. 30 km east of Colombo), where King Siri Saṅghabodhi (307–309/247–249), who abdicated and retired to the forests donated his head, on which his successor had put a price, to a poor villager, thus proving to be a Bodhisatta.

As in a Vāṃsa, events referring to sacred places are communicated. At the same time the virtues of the king are often compared to those of the Bodhisatta, as related in the Jātakas, thus bringing Att near to an Avadāna.

197. The chronicle ending during the reign of Parakkamabāhu II. (1234–1269) is referred to for the first time in the Pūjāvaliya in 1266. The anonymous author was evidently familiar with Sanskrit texts such as the Jātakamālā or Bāṇa's Kādambarī<sup>344</sup>.

(Aṭṭha-k: 4.1.15) "Story of the Eight Hair Relics" is mentioned by J.Filliozat, BEFEO 79.1992: 232.

<sup>344</sup> Malalasekera, p. 17 in his important introduction to Att. On Sanskrit authors known in Ceylon: Godakumbura 1943, cf. also Upās p. 107.

## IV.10 Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā

**Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā (Samantak: 4.1.9):** Edition: Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā of Vedeha Thera Edited by C.E.Godakumbura. London 1958; translation: In Praise of Mount Samanta (Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā) by Vedeha Thera Translated by A.A. Hazlewood. London 1986.

**198.** This poem, written by Vedeha, who is also the author of the Rasavāhinī (§ 413), in the 13th century, describes the visits of the Buddha to Ceylon in 757 verses, particularly the third visit during which the Buddha left an imprint of his foot on the mountain Samantakūṭa (Samaṇola or Adam's Peak) to be worshipped by pious Buddhists<sup>345</sup>.

## IV.11 Saṅgītiyaṃsa

**Saṅgītiyaṃsa ([Sgv]: 4.2.2):** Edition. Saṅgītiyavaṇṇā. Baṇśāvatār reūaṇ<sup>1</sup> saṅgāyanā brah dharmavinaiy. Somdec brah Vanaratana Vat Brah Jetuban nai rājakāla dī<sup>1</sup> 1 teen<sup>1</sup> bhāsā magadh, Brahyā Pariyāti Dharmadhātā (Bee Tālakakṣaṇa) perīyeñ plee pen bhāsā daiy. Bangkok 1923 (repr. as cremation book 1978) [History of the councils on Dhamma and Vinaya. Composed in Pāli during the reign of Rāma I. by the Most Venerable Vanaratana from Vat Jetavana, translated into Thai by Dharmadhātā]; Pariccheda 7 is edited in: G.Cœdès: Une recension pâlie des annales d'Ayuthya. BEFEO 14.1914,1–31 (pagination of the off print).

**199.** The “Chronicle of the Councils” written in verse mixed with prose covers in nine Pariccheda nine councils including those held in Siam in AD 1477/8 in Chiang Mai under king Tilaka (Tiloka) (1442–1487) and in 1788/9 in Bangkok under Rāma I. (1782–1809) to reconstitute the sacred texts after the destruction of the old Siamese capital Ayuthaya (Ayodhya) by the Burmese in 1767. This council is the occasion for Vanaratana Vimaladhamma from the Jetavana monastery in Bangkok to compile his text in 1789, which contains hardly anything original<sup>346</sup>. One of the sources used is Jinak (§ 428).

<sup>345</sup> Cf. Paranavitana 1958.

<sup>346</sup> The position of the Saṅgītiyaṃsa in Thai historical literature has been discussed by Wyatt 1976/1994: 115 sq./13, cf. Saddhātissa 1974: 219; cf. also Hazra 1986: 42–46.

## IV.12 Anāgatavaṃsa

**Anāgatavaṃsa (Anāg: 4.4.1):** Edition: I.P.Minayeff, JPTS 1886; E.Leumann 1919.

**200.** Time and place of origin of the “Story of the Future” are uncertain. According to the late Gv (Gv 61,1, cf. § 4) it is the work of Kassapa Coḷa (cf. § 338)<sup>347</sup>.

The text, which is extant in different versions, describes in about 150 verses the events which will happen once the future Buddha Metteyya will be born. Texts concerning Metteyya/Maitreya seem to have been more popular in Buddhist schools other than Theravāda<sup>348</sup>.

Different commentaries exist in manuscript form<sup>349</sup>.

## IV.13 Dasabodhisattauddesa

**Dasabodhisattauddesa (Dasab: 4.4.2):** Edition: Dasabodhisattauddesa, texte pâli publié avec une traduction et un index grammatical par F. Martini. BEFEO 36.1936: 287–413.

**201.** The “Instruction about the Ten (Future) Bodhisattas<sup>350</sup>” has been composed at an uncertain, but late date perhaps in Kambodia, as indicated by the peculiarities of SE–Asian Pāli<sup>351</sup>.

Beginning with Metteyya future Bodhisattas, who are sometimes persons well known from canonical literature such as the king of Kosala Pasenadi, are enumerated arranged according to the *kappas* “world ages” during which they are expected to appear.

## IV.14 Dasabodhisattuppattikathā

**[Dasabodhisattuppattikathā (Dbk: 4.4.3)]:** Editions: as 4.4.2 Dasab; The Birth Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas and the Dasabodhisattuppattika-

<sup>347</sup> The text referred to at Vism 434,12–3 is not this Anāg.

<sup>348</sup> Cf. Leumann’s edition, Lévi 1932 and Jaini 1988.

<sup>349</sup> Filliozat 1993.

<sup>350</sup> There is no uniform title to this text. The manuscripts also have: Anāgatavaṃsa, Anāgatadasabuddhavaṃsa “Story of the Ten Future Buddhas”.

<sup>351</sup> Cf. Supaphan 1990: 190–196.

thā Being a Translation and Edition of the Dbk by H.Saddhātissa. London 1975<sup>352</sup>.

**202.** The content of Dbk is identical with Dasab, but the literary form of Dbk is that of the apocryphal Suttantas beginning *evaṃ me sutaṃ* .... The text is handed down in a Sinhalese and in a Kambodian version, which seem to be slightly different. Saddhātissa uses only the Sinhalese version, which he dates arbitrarily into the 14th century.

The extremely brief [**Dasabodhisattavidhi (Dbv: 4.4.31)**] is a summary of Dbk published by Saddhātissa 1975: 4.

---

<sup>352</sup> The existence of the earlier edition by Martini has escaped Saddhātissa's attention.

## V. The Commentaries

203. The commentaries on the Tipiṭaka lay down the orthodox interpretation current in the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura and established by Buddhaghosa's Visuddhimagga (§ 245sq.).

There are different sets of commentaries, the oldest extant being the *Atthakathā*<sup>353</sup> commenting immediately on the canonical texts called *pāṭi*<sup>354</sup>. The commentators ahistorically try to trace this terminology back to the Tipiṭaka: *atthañ ca dhammañ ca*, AN I 69,23 is explained as: *atthakathañ ca pāṭiñ ca*, Mp II 143,14<sup>355</sup>.

Subcommentaries are called *ṭīkā*s (cf. § 355), which may be subdivided into *mūla*-, "basic –", *purāṇa*- "old –", *mahā*-, "great –", *anu*- "sub-", *nava*- "new –" *abhinava-ṭīkā* "very new subcommentary". While all canonical texts are covered by an *Atthakathā*, there is no complete set of *ṭīkā*s.

A still later set of subcommentaries mostly composed in Thailand is called *atthayojanā* (§ 379). Hardly anything is known as yet about the commentaries called *gūlhaṭṭhadīpanī* "explanation of the hidden meaning" (cf. § 308 note 516).

Besides these sets there are commentaries called *gaṇṭhipada* (*vivaraṇa*)s "(explanations of) knotty words<sup>356</sup>". The earliest, which are known from quotations, are datable only after Buddhaghosa and were most likely written in Sinhalese<sup>357</sup>.

The native languages of the Theravāda countries have also been used for later exegetical literature, which is usually a combination of translation and interpretation. These commentaries are called in Sinhalese *sannaya*, in Burma *nissaya*,<sup>358</sup> and in Thailand either *nissaya* or

<sup>353</sup> Cf. CPD s.v.; on the terminology: Sadd 5.3.3.3.

<sup>354</sup> v. Hinüber 1993: 225 sq., cf. Collins 1990: 91 sq.

<sup>355</sup> For further material: Geiger 1973: 161.

<sup>356</sup> Defined at Ps-pt I 56,3 *ad* Ps I 17,1. On different kinds of explanations cf. also Vism 442,19 sq. (with Vism-mht) qu. Paṭis-a I 7,10.

<sup>357</sup> Bollée 1969: 832.

<sup>358</sup> On *nissaya*: Pruitt 1994.

*vohāra*<sup>359</sup>, to which the *nāmasap*, a word-for-word explanation can be added.

204. The commentaries are a literary genre of their own as a combination of explanations of words and grammatical forms with philosophical, theological or juridical literature. The commentaries also contain stories, some such as the *Jātakatthavaṇṇanā* or the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā* to such an extent that they rather belong to the narrative literature.

205. So far the commentaries have been used by western scholarship either for understanding the Tipiṭaka or as sources for narrative literature in India<sup>360</sup>. Their structure has hardly been investigated. Preliminary studies more concerned with their sources are Adikaram 1946, Lottermoser 1979 or Mori 1989<sup>361</sup>.

206. The commentaries as we have them are the result of a long development based on two kinds of older sources. According to the tradition, commentaries are assumed to have been recited already on the occasion of the first council (Sv 1,15\*sq., As 1,27\*sq., cf. Sv-pt II 217,16 etc.). Then Mahinda is thought to have brought them to Ceylon in the third century BC, where they were translated into Sinhalese (Sv 1,17\*, As 1,29\*)<sup>362</sup>, to be retranslated into Pāli by Buddhaghosa. Consequently the old and superseded Sinhalese commentary is called *Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā*<sup>363</sup>.

A second source are the opinions of individual Theras quoted by name in the *Aṭṭhakathā*. As far as these Theras can be dated, almost all of them lived before AD 100<sup>364</sup>. Consequently it appears that scholarly discussions were interrupted from about 150 to 400 AD, perhaps due to a temporary decline in learning. This may also be the reason for an intended translation of the Suttantas into Sinhalese suggested by king Buddhadāsa (AD 362–409/302–349) (Mhv XXXVII 175). In

<sup>359</sup> The difference, if any, between *nissaya* and *vohāra* is not clear.

<sup>360</sup> Winternitz 1933: 183–209.

<sup>361</sup> Nothing new can be learned from Hazra 1991. L.R.Goonasekere: *Buddhist Commentarial Literature*. Kandy 1967 is a popular book.

<sup>362</sup> Quotations from the original *Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā* have been traced by H.Smith 1950: 185 § 5 in *Dhp-a-gp*. Doubts about Sinhalese as the only language of the old commentaries: Pind 1992a: 138.

<sup>363</sup> Adikaram 1946: 10 lists 16 titles of older commentaries. Probably sometimes more than one name is used for the same text.

<sup>364</sup> Adikaram 1946: 87 and § 211,317 on possible dates for the old *Aṭṭhakathā*.

the same way the awkward language of *Dīp* does not show an intimate acquaintance with Pāli<sup>365</sup> (but cf. § 183).

Other Theras are quoted anonymously perhaps out of politeness, because their opinions are rejected<sup>366</sup>.

It is not clear whether these collections of opinions were handed down orally or in a written form<sup>367</sup>. Nor is the language known: It may have been Pāli or Sinhalese, as in the *Sīhalaṭṭhakatha*.

207. The most important commentator is **Buddhaghosa**, who composed the *Visuddhimagga* (§ 245sq.) and the commentaries on the first four *Nikāyas*. The very few details known about his life have been collected by L. Finot (1864–1935)<sup>368</sup>. The only sources are the *nigamanas* “explicit” of the commentaries and Mhv XXXVII 215–246, for the anonymous **Buddhaghosuppatti** (**Bu-up: 4.2.4**)<sup>369</sup> or other sources discussed by Finot appear to provide still less reliable information.

Although the second part of Mhv composed about 700 years after Buddhaghosa’s times says that he hailed from north India near Bodh Gayā with the obvious intention of bringing him near to the cradle of Buddhism, he almost certainly was a Southerner<sup>370</sup>, who at least for some time lived in Kāñcī (Mp V 98,4\*).

According to Mhv, Buddhaghosa was a contemporary of King Mahānāma (AD 409–431/349–371<sup>371</sup>). This is not confirmed by the evidence of the *nigamanas*. Only the colophon to the *Samantapāsādikā* mentions the otherwise unknown king Sirinivāsa (Sp 1415,18\*), generally supposed to be identical with Mahānāma.

The date, however, is indirectly supported by the fact that Buddhaghosa is not mentioned in the first part of Mhv ending with King

<sup>365</sup> Cf. Geiger 1960/1986: 68 = § 65.

<sup>366</sup> Sadd 5.3.3.3, cf. Adikaram 1946: 10 and Horner 1981.

<sup>367</sup> Vmv II 264,5 states that Buddhaghosa used only the tradition written down: Bollée 1969: 830 with note 42.

<sup>368</sup> Finot 1921 = 1924. This article seems to be almost forgotten. The same material is dealt with again by Malalasekera 1928: 79–101, Buddhadatta 1944/1957, Law 1956, and Nānamoli, *Vism-trsl* p. XII–XXVII without referring to Finot or leading to new insights. Different discussions on the date of Buddhaghosa have been summed up by Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 163–167.

<sup>369</sup> Ed. by J. Gray 1892. The text is sometimes ascribed to the Burmese Mahāmaṅgala and dated into the 15th century, cf. Nānamoli, *Vism-trsl* p. XXIV.

<sup>370</sup> Buddhadatta 1944/1957: 147, 157.

<sup>371</sup> Cf. note 308 above.



Mahāsenā (AD 334–362/274–302), and by the Chinese translation of the Samantapāsādikā dated AD 489<sup>372</sup>, which does not mention the name Buddhaghosa, but quotes Vism<sup>373</sup>. Therefore, the brackets for Buddhaghosa's dates are about AD 370 to 450.

Mhv ascribes far too many commentaries to him together with a book named Nāṇodaya, which he is supposed to have composed while living in India. Nothing else is known about it (cf. § 448).

## V.1 The Commentaries on the Vinaya

### V.1.1 The Samantapāsādikā

**Samantapāsādikā (Sp: 1.2,1):** Edition: J.Takakusu and M.Nagai I (1924), II (1927), III (1930), IV (1934), V (1938), VI (1947), VII (1947), VIII [Indexes Compiled by H.Kopp. London s.d.] (1978)<sup>374</sup>; translation: N.A.Jayawickrama: The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna being a Translation and Edition of the Bāhiranidāna ... London 1962 [ed. and trsl. of Sp 1,4\*-105,22]; cf. Bapat/Hirakawa 1970.

Subcommentaries: Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā (§ 367–371); Sāratthadīpanī (§ 373sq.); Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā (§ 379); cf. § 419 note 693.

**208.** The introductory verses to Sp (Sp 1,4\*-3,12\*) contain valuable information about the scope and purpose of the work, which was composed at the initiative (*ajjhesana*, Sp 2,13\*) of an unknown monk Buddhāsiri (Sp 2,13\*). The author intends to translate the existing commentaries, which he studied under an equally unknown monk Buddhāmitta (Sp 1415,3\*)<sup>375</sup>, from Sinhalese into Pāli to make the orthodox opinion of the Mahāvihāra internationally accessible (Sp 2,3\*-10\*).

All important decisions (*vinicchaya*, Sp 3,7\*) will be collected and summarized (Sp 3,6). This will be done without leaving out of consideration the opinion of the experts in the Suttantas (Sp 3,9\* sq.).

<sup>372</sup> Bapat/Hirakawa 1970: XIII.

<sup>373</sup> Bapat/Hirakawa 1970: LVII.

<sup>374</sup> Sp 4,6–104,16 has been edited in 1881: Vin III 283,9–343,13.

<sup>375</sup> Jayawickrama, Sp-trsl p. 2 note 5 (=p. 95) arbitrarily assumes that Buddhāmitta and Buddhāsiri are the same person.

209. At the end of Sp the title is explained (Sp 201,24\*-202,3\* = 1414,26\*-32\*) and the place where the author worked is named as Mahāmeghavanaauyyāna (Sp 1415,5\*)<sup>376</sup>. If the colophon is to be believed the task of composing Sp was completed with astonishing speed during the 20th and 21st years of king Sirinivāsa (cf. § 207), which might correspond to AD 429/430 or 369/370 (Sp 1415,19\* sq.).

The name of the author occurs neither here nor in the Chinese translation of Sp. Consequently, Finot<sup>377</sup> has put forward the attractive opinion that Sp still was an anonymous text at the time when Saṅghabhadra translated it in AD 489<sup>378</sup>. As far as we can see the name Buddhaghosa is connected to Sp for the first time by Vajrabuddhi (Vjb 1,14\*).

210. Only the introduction to Sp names sources (Sp 2,16\*-18\*): Mahāaṭṭhakathā, Mahāpaccaṛī, Kurundī, which are subsumed under Sihaṭṭhakathā (Sp 1415,2\*) etc. Supplemented by the subcommentaries (Vjb 18,24 sq.; Sp-ṭ I 16,20 sq.; Vmv I 6,21) altogether seven pre-Sp commentaries are known by title<sup>379</sup> and the following six are actually quoted:

1. Kurundī: about 70 quotations
2. Mahā-aṭṭhakathā: about 50 quotations
3. Mahāpaccaṛī: about 50 quotations
4. Andhaka-aṭṭhakathā: about 35 quotations
5. Saṅkhepa-aṭṭhakathā: about 10 quotations
6. Paccaṛī: 1 quotation

It is not clear whether or not the Cūlapaccaṛī mentioned by Vajrabuddhi (Vjb 18, 15) is identical with the Paccaṛī.

These subcommentaries were not superseded at once when Sp was completed. On the contrary they were still in use in the 12th century,

<sup>376</sup> This is a part of the Mahāvihāra: Mhv-trsl on Mhv XI 2.

<sup>377</sup> Finot 1924: 83. Following the translation by Bapat/Hirakawa 1970: 106, cf. note 81 and p. LVII. – Saṅghabhadra thought when translating Sp 147,9 that the author of Sp and Vism was the same person: “I have explained ... in the Path of Purity”. – As Wang 1994:172 points out, a Theravāda-Vinaya was also translated into Chinese. This translation is now lost.

<sup>378</sup> On the relation between Sp and its Chinese translation: Demiéville 1950: 289: “traduction d’un prototype de Sp”. The paragraph on *simā*, Sp 1036,14–1054,16 has been compared to the Chinese translation by Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 171–182.

<sup>379</sup> Vjb refers to an unknown commentary called *Pannavāra*: 1.2,00, Vjb 18,25 (§ 448).

when they disappeared only after the reforms by Parakkamabāhu I. (1153–1186)<sup>380</sup>.

**211.** So far only the quotations of the *Andhaka-aṭṭhakathā* in *Sp* have been collected systematically by Kieffer-Pülz 1993, who also draws attention to terminological peculiarities of this commentary. Similar observations have been made earlier concerning *Kurundī* and *Mahā-paccarī*<sup>381</sup>. Therefore, the terminology could be used for tracing further quotations even when these are not marked as such.

The *Andhaka-aṭṭhakathā* is quoted only in the commentary on *Suttavibhaṅga* and *Khandhaka*, but not for the *Parivāra*<sup>382</sup>. Unless this is so by mere chance, it may indicate that the date of the *Andhaka-aṭṭhakathā* might be earlier than the *Parivāra* (§ 42).

It is an important task of future research to collect all quotations of earlier commentaries and to evaluate them<sup>383</sup>.

**212.** After enumerating briefly the methods to be applied in the commentary (*Sp* 3,13–20\*), the history of Buddhism from the first council up to Mahinda is described at length in the *Bāhiranidānavañṇanā* (*Sp* 4,6–105,22) (cf. § 228). This is based on the historical introduction to the *Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā*, which has also been used in *Dīp* and *Mhv* (§ 182).

This section contains detailed lists of the contents of the *Tiṭṭhaka* (*Sp* 14,11–16,17; 18,1–19) and particularly of the *Nikāyas* (*Sp* 26,18–28,3) (cf. § 85).

**213.** Before the commentary on the *Vinaya* proper begins, an unusually long section called *Verañjakaṇḍa* (*Sp* 106,4–201,20) deals with the brief introduction to the *Suttavibhaṅga* (*Vin* III 1,6–11,33). This relation of 1 : 10 between text and commentary does not reoccur in *Sp*.

The content of this discussion does not at all concern Buddhist law, but is devoted exclusively to matters of the teaching. Thus this part of *Sp* seems to be meant as a basic instruction on *Dhamma* for the *Vinaya* expert. For more detailed information the reader is referred to the *Visuddhimagga* (*Sp* 159,7) or to other commentaries such as

<sup>380</sup> Bollée 1969: 828.

<sup>381</sup> v. Hinüber 1979.

<sup>382</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 1993: 173.

<sup>383</sup> According to Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 173 *Sp* often rejects the opinion of the *Andhaka-aṭṭhakathā*.

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (Sp 172,30), Papañcasūdanī (Sp 173,3), or Atthasālinī (Sp 150,28). In the same way an explanation of the *paṭiccasamuppāda*, Vin I 1,9 is avoided at Sp 953,5–9 by referring to Vism and Paṭṭh. Further, it is stated expressly that the commentator wants to concentrate on the Vinaya and to leave aside matters relating to the Suttantas (Sp 965,15) in the main body of his commentary.

**214.** The explanation of Buddhist law begins with introductory verses like a separate text at Sp 201,23. Following the method of the *apubbapadavaṇṇanā*, Sp 517,6 etc. “explaining words not explained before<sup>384</sup>” (cf. § 256, 293), that is avoiding repetitions, the commentary becomes shorter and shorter towards the end (cf. § 230).

An important rule for reading the discussions of different views in the commentary is: “everywhere (in this commentary) the opinion of the *aṭṭhakathā* or of a *thera* which is mentioned at the end (of a discussion), is to be considered as valid (Sp 300,8sq.)”.

Furthermore, *mahāpadesas* for the Vinaya are introduced (Sp 230,27–233,2, cf. § 230).

The longest section is devoted to the 4 Pārājikas (Sp 202,4–516,18) and particularly to the second one dealing with theft. (Sp 285,5–392,23), because here the important property law is expounded in great detail.

**215.** In addition to what has been said above (§ 213sq.) the commentator occasionally hints at the plan according to which Sp has been constructed. Of particular interest are those remarks referring to changes in the arrangement of the subject matter deviating from the older commentaries. Thus it is said in commenting on the first Pārājika: “here all *Aṭṭhakathās* explain the lower (*pabbajjā*) and higher ordination (*upasampadā*). We, however, will explain this in the *Khandhaka* following the fixed sequence of the basic text (*thitapāḷivasena*)” (Sp 206,18 sq. *ad* Vin III 15,2) (cf. § 225). Similar remarks concerning the explanations of *bhikkhu* and the *vinayakammas* are found at Sp 243,10 sq. (*ad* Vin III 24,10), and on *cīvara*, Sp 379,7 sq. (*ad* Vin III 58,22–24)<sup>385</sup>.

Obviously, these remarks are useful only to monks still familiar with the old *Aṭṭhakathā*. At the same time it shows that a very con-

<sup>384</sup> Cf. *amuttānapadavaṇṇanā*, Sp 129, 31 etc. “(only) explaining doubtful words”.

<sup>385</sup> Cf. Sp 589,25; 840,5–8 and on Kkh § 224 sq.

siderable amount of text has been shifted from the Pārājikakaṇḍa to later parts of Sp changing the structure of the commentary completely.

The original commentary on the Pārājika seems to have comprised almost all important topics of law. Therefore, it is likely that the Saṅkhepa-aṭṭhakathā quoted only in the Pārājikakaṇḍa did indeed comment only on this part of the old Vinaya-Aṭṭhakathā. If so, the title may not mean that the commentary as such was a brief one, but can be explained perhaps from the fact that it extended only to this part of what is now Sp.

**216.** The commentary quotes the four Pārājikas by numbers<sup>386</sup>, although there are old key words such as *methunadhamma* (Vin II 286,25)<sup>387</sup>. Subdivisions of longer sections are called -*vatthu* : *maḁaṭṭi-vatthukathā*, Sp 228,22 (cf. Vin III 22,37) “commentary dealing with the subject ‘monkey’”. The key words and the *Vatthu* names are used for cross references within Sp (cf. § 22 and 223).

The commentary on the individual rules follows a fixed pattern in the four Pārājikas. This is continued into the Saṃghādisesa but slowly changes. In contrast to the Pārājikas the name of the Saṃghādisesas is given at the beginning of each section. The commentary on Saṃghādisesa 13 contains a long insertion fitted badly into the context and perhaps taken over from the old Aṭṭhakathā (Sp 617,12–620,25): The first part concerns law (*āpattivinicchaya*, Sp 617,13, cf. CPD), the second one flowers. This is at the same time one of the many interesting and important descriptions of daily life found in Sp.

The form of the commentary on the Pācittiyas is again different, beginning: “here follows the first rule in the section on *musāvāda* ‘lies’” (Sp 735,8). Thus all 92 rules are divided into groups of ten and then counted individually. The comments on the 75 Sekkhiya (Sp 889,3–899,5) rules and on the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga (Sp 900,3–949,4) are rather brief.

**217.** The same is true for the commentary on the Khandhaka: Mahāvagga: Sp 951–1154; Cullavagga: Sp 1154–1300 and on the Parivāra: Sp 1301–1414. The name of the respective Khandhaka is found at the beginning: *uposathakkhandhake*, Sp 1034,22 etc. There are no long digressions as found occasionally in earlier parts of Sp.

<sup>386</sup> E.g. Sp 298,7.

<sup>387</sup> This continues Vedic usage on which see: Thieme 1972: 20; cf. § 238.

**218.** These digressions are occasionally called *pakiṇṇaka*, a term also used in other commentaries. These may begin with a *kārikā* as Sp 270,17\* and deal with matters of general importance such as the *samutṭhānas* “origins” (Sp 270,17\*-271,33) of an offence<sup>388</sup>. Some digressions may have been taken over from the old *Aṭṭhakathā* as stated once: “here a digression is found in the *Mahāpaccari*” (Sp 803,19).

A second term found only (?) in Sp<sup>389</sup> is *pālimuttaka* “detached from the canon”. These are paragraphs containing opinions on Buddhist law not found in, but based on the *Vinaya* (Sp 332,17 etc.). It is interesting that the *Pālimuttakas* are introduced by different wordings in different parts of Sp<sup>390</sup>.

**219.** In spite of the fact that the basics of the *Dhamma* were communicated in the *Verañjakaṇḍa* (§ 213) there is one long text devoted to yogic practices in the commentary on the 3.*Pārājika*. When Vin III 70,19–71,13 quotes a relevant passage from SN V 321,21–322,9, the explanations to both texts necessarily run parallel as well: Sp 402,26–404,23 corresponds to Spk III 269,23–270,30, though Sp has been reshaped in certain respects by the help of *Vism*.

It is obvious that Sp has borrowed this text though not immediately from either *Vism* or Spk, because all three are slightly different and differently fit into the respective contexts. Therefore, it is impossible to tell which commentary quotes which. Rather it seems that the texts ultimately perhaps based on the old *Aṭṭhakathā* were harmonized when the *Aṭṭhakathā* in Pāli was composed. How this redaction was carried through still needs investigation (cf. § 239).

**220.** It does not seem unlikely that perhaps three different specialists were at work, when Sp as a whole was created: A “historian” may have helped to compose the *Bāhiraṇidānakathā* (§ 212), a “theologian” could have been consulted for the *Verañjakaṇḍa* (§ 213), and finally a “lawyer” shaped the main body of the text.

Given the length of the commentary on single groups of offences, it is possible that different redactors may have been entrusted with the task of explaining separate sets of rules such as *Pārājika* etc.

<sup>388</sup> v. Hinüber 1992.

<sup>389</sup> Cf. *aṭṭhakathāmuttaka*, Pp-a 174,26, (§ 312).

<sup>390</sup> It seems that the word *pālimuttaka* has been used in a different sense in the title of *Pālim* (§ 334) meaning “independent arrangement (of the text)” rather.

This would explain certain discrepancies in the form of the commentary changing e.g. from *Pārājika* to *Pācittiya*. One passage is of particular interest in this context: The commentary on the 11. *Pācittiya* (Sp 768,22–769,7) refers back to the 3. *Pārājika* by stating that the opinion quoted is found in all old *Aṭṭhakathās*. Interestingly, the commentary on the 3. *Pārājika* referred to (Sp 476,28–478,6) is identical as far as the opinion referred to is concerned, but at the same time the text has been developed considerably, *Theras* are quoted and so is the *San̄khepa-aṭṭhakathā*. If the 11. *Pācittiya* refers back to the old *Aṭṭhakathā* on the 3. *Pārājika*, and not to the more modern text in Sp itself, this seems to indicate that both the commentary on the 3. *Pārājika* and the 11. *Pācittiya* may have been composed simultaneously thus ruling out a cross reference at the time of writing.

Therefore it appears that the main text, too, was not the work of a single person. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the chief redactor was *Buddhaghosa*, whose *Visuddhimagga* is quoted in Sp as a dogmatic authority, possibly by an equally authoritative though anonymous law expert.

### V.1.2 The *Khaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

***Khaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh: 1.1,1):** Edition: *Khaṅkhāvitaraṇī nāma Mātikaṭṭhakathā*. *Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Pātimokkha* Edited by D. Maskell. London 1956.

Subcommentaries: *Khaṅkhāvitāraṇīporāṇaṭṭikā* (§ 377); *Vinayatthamañjūsā* (§ 378); [*Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-atthayojanā-mahāṭṭikā* (Kkh-y: 1.1,13)]: Bollée 1968a: 315.

221. This anonymous explanation of the *Pātimokkhasutta* (§ 15) was written at the initiative of an otherwise-unknown monk *Soṇa* (Kkh 1,13\*), who is also mentioned in the concluding verses, which have been omitted in E<sup>e391</sup>. They refer the *Sīhaḷa-* and *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā* as sources of Kkh. Further, a *Sīhaḷamātikaṭṭhakathā* is once mentioned in the text (Kkh 159,26), which may have been a predecessor of Kkh. Old Vinaya commentaries are rarely quoted in Kkh.

<sup>391</sup> The “*Buddhaghosa colophon*” added to all *Aṭṭhakathās* ascribed to him, is found only in B<sup>e</sup> and transcribed in v. Hinüber 1995b.

At the end of B<sup>e</sup><sup>392</sup> the title is given as Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpātimokkha-vaṇṇanā “Commentary on the Pātimokkha Overcoming Doubts<sup>393</sup>.”

222. As Kkh also comments on the introduction not found in the Pātimokkhasutta as embedded in the Vin, it guarantees a tradition of this text independent from the Suttavibhaṅga (§ 15). Modern editions of the Pātimokkhasutta contain introductions neither identical with each other nor with Kkh<sup>394</sup>.

223. As a brief handbook for practical purposes Kkh avoids theoretical considerations often found in Sp: Consequently, comments in Kkh are about four times shorter. In the explanations of the individual rules Kkh follows a fixed pattern in contrast to the changing one in Sp (§ 216). The terminology differs slightly from Sp as well: The concept of *aṅgas*, which are key words helping to memorize the essential contents of the rules is typical only to Kkh<sup>395</sup>. Further, the titles of the rules are not identical in both these texts: The 3.Pārājika e.g. is called in the Vin and in Sp *manussaviggaha* (Vin II 286,37; Sp 768,22), but in Kkh *jīvitavoropānavatthu* (Kkh 32,19)<sup>396</sup>. This facilitates cross references: *aññātakaviññatti-sikkhāpada*, Kkh 77,21 can refer only to Sp 667,22, but not to the corresponding rule in Kkh named *cīvaraviññāpana-vatthu*, Kkh 64,30. The same is true for the titles of Vaggas: *senāsanavagga*, Sp 759,21 corresponds to *bhūtagāmaavagga*, Kkh 88,9. In contrast to Sp all rules are numbered in Kkh.

224. Both Sp and Kkh are ascribed to Buddhaghosa. This is unlikely for Sp (§ 209, 220). In the light of the differences between both commentaries the assumption of a common author is not convincing. The discrepancies in the paragraph on the preparations to the *uposatha* seem to indicate a certain period of time elapsed between Sp and Kkh during which these changes were introduced, provided both commentaries were composed at the same place.

<sup>392</sup> B<sup>e</sup> 1968 also contains the Pātimokkhasutta: Dvematikāpāli, p. 1–36.

<sup>393</sup> The title Mātikaṭṭhakathā used in E<sup>e</sup> is found in Vjb 184,22, cf. Sp-ṭ III 274,9, Kkh-ṭ 1,5\*, Kkh-nṭ 489,2\*.

<sup>394</sup> Dickson 1876: 71; Nāṇamoli 1966: 7–11; Kkh B<sup>e</sup> 1968 (= Pātimokkhasutta): 1,5–15 = Sp 1063,1–14 ≠ (!) Kkh 4,10–11,7. This text is based on Vin I 118,1–119,8.

<sup>395</sup> Kkh p. IX § 4.

<sup>396</sup> The term *vatthu* is used differently in Sp: § 216.



It is certain, however, that Kkh presupposes Sp, because the latter is referred to frequently for a more elaborate discussion, e.g. Kkh 50,30. Sp does not know Kkh.

The few passages where Kkh is more detailed than Sp are highly interesting: under the heading *bhikkhu*, Kkh 17,19–19,37 (§ 225) contains information on *upasampadā*. In a similar way *sīmā*, Kkh 4,22–8,19, *kaṭhina* and *cīvara*, Kkh 53,21–56,13 are dealt with, though the corresponding basic texts belong to the Khandhaka. The obvious intention of Kkh is to convey all the essential practical knowledge on the Vinaya in an abbreviated form to the monks.

**225.** In spite of the isolated reference to the *Sīhaḷamātikatṭhakathā* (§ 221) it is not clear, whether there was an immediate predecessor to Kkh, although obviously Kkh used the old *Aṭṭhakathā*. In the explanation of the 38. *Pācittiya* Sp 840,5–7 refers its reader to the *Kappiyabhūmikathā* in the commentary on the *Bhesajjakkhandhaka*, thus changing the sequence of texts of the old *Aṭṭhakathā* (Sp 840,5). Kkh, on the other hand, follows the old *Aṭṭhakathā* and keeps the relevant information here: Kkh 109,17–111,4 (38. *Pācittiya*) corresponds to Sp 1098,11–1105,29 (*Kappiyabhūmikathā*). Luckily both Kkh 110,26 and Sp 1100,10 quote the same passage from the *Mahāpaccarī*, which therefore seems to have been quoted in the old *Aṭṭhakathā* on the 38. *Pācittiya* already. Consequently, there is no doubt that Sp transferred a text, which is still found in the original place in Kkh. As the wording is not identical, Kkh cannot simply have adopted it from Sp, but both must have used the old *Aṭṭhakathā* directly and independently.

The same procedure can be observed again in the commentary on *bhikkhu*, Kkh 17,19–19,37 sq., where the text on *upasampadā* is found, which Sp shifted to the *Khandhaka* (§ 215).

Rare as they seem to be, these examples allow us to reconstruct small pieces of the old *Aṭṭhakathā* and show the redactors of the Vinaya commentaries at work. Further, they indicate that the older commentaries may have been quoted indirectly occasionally, as in this particular case not from the *Mahāpaccarī* itself, but from the *Sīhaḷatṭhakathā*.

## V.2 The Commentaries on the Suttapiṭaka

### V.2.1 The Commentaries on the First Four Nikāyas

**Sumaṅgalavilāsinī** (Sv: 2.1,1): Edition: T.W.Rhys Davids and J.Estlin Carpenter I (1886); W.Stede II (1931), III (1932) [repinted with appendices: I (1968), II, III (1971)].

Subcommentaries: Līnatthappakāsinī (§ 358); Sādhujanavilāsinī (§ 382).

**Papañcasūdanī** (Ps: 2.2,1): Edition: J.Woods and D.Kosambi I (1922), II (1928); I.B.Horner III (1933), IV (1937), V (1938).

Subcommentary: Līnatthappakāsinī (§ 358).

**Sāratthappakāsinī** (Spk: 2.3,1): Edition: F.L.Woodward I (1929), II (1932), III (1937).

Sucommentary: Līnatthappakāsinī (§ 358).

**Manorathapūraṇī** (Mp: 2.4,1): Edition: E.Hardy and M.Walleser I (1924; <sup>2</sup>1973), M.Walleser and H.Kopp II (1930; <sup>2</sup>1967); H.Kopp III (1936), IV (1940), V (1956)<sup>397</sup>.

Subcommentary: Sāratthamañjūsā (§ 378).

226. The commentaries on DN, MN, SN, and AN form a unit together with the Visuddhimagga, which is underlined by the introductory verses stating that Vism is “in the middle of the four Āgamas<sup>398</sup>” (Sv 2,6\* = Ps I 2,10\* = Spk I 2,18\* = Mp I 2,24\*). It is also said expressly that these commentaries and Vism have a common author: *Visuddhimagge mayā ... vuttam*, Sv 2,3\* etc. Each of these four units claims to give a complete description of the teaching, which may be due to the *bhāṇaka*-system (§ 49)<sup>399</sup>.

227. The introductory and the concluding verses are for the better part identical in all four commentaries<sup>400</sup>. They contain the following information:

<sup>397</sup> None of these commentaries has been translated.

<sup>398</sup> In the introductory āryā-verses Buddhaghosa uses *āgama* instead of *nikāya* and *Majjhimasāṅgīti*, Ps I 2,3\*, cf. *catasso saṃgītiyo*, Sv 14,7 “four Nikāyas”, *Dīghasamgīti*, Sv 14,8.

<sup>399</sup> This, in a way, corresponds to the self-sufficiency of the Vedic *śākhās*, e.g., of the Yajurveda, cf. Gonda 1975: 323.

<sup>400</sup> The concluding verses of Sv have been omitted in E°. They are published in v. Hinüber 1995b.

## I. Initiators of the commentaries:

1. Sv: The Saṃghathera<sup>401</sup> Dāṭhanāga from the Sumaṅgalapariveṇa
2. Ps: Bhadanta Buddhmitta, whom Buddhaghosa met in Mayūra-rūpapattāna
3. Spk: Bhadanta Jotipāla
4. Mp: Bhadanta Jotipāla, whom Buddhaghosa met in Kāñcī and Jīvaka from the Mahāvihāra in Tambapaṇṇidīpa “Island Ceylon”

As Jotipāla is named in both Spk and Mp and as only these texts have the introductory verses Spk I 2,3\*-8\* = Mp I 2,8\*-14\* in common they may form a subunit (§ 230).

It is important that Kāñcī is mentioned which connects Buddhaghosa to South India (§ 207).

## II. The names of the commentaries:

Sv is named after the Sumaṅgalapariveṇa, where the initiator lived, the names of Ps and Spk are only mentioned, and Mp, strangely enough, is explained as “filling with joy about the explanation of all (!) Āgamas.”

It was perhaps necessary to invent these names to distinguish the “new” from the “old” Aṭṭhakathā: Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā, Vism 432,26 obviously refers to the old Aṭṭhakathā, as the text quoted is not found in Spk. The same is perhaps true for Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, Vism 72,24. Therefore it is not unlikely that Vism occasionally quotes and thus preserves material from the “old” Aṭṭhakathā otherwise lost, because it was not included elsewhere into the “new” Aṭṭhakathā (cf. § 249).

III. A brief characteristic of the commentaries is given, such as “destroyer of heretical opinions” (Ps V 109,11\*).

## IV. The length of the texts together with Vism is mentioned:

1. Sv: 81 + 59 = 140 *bhāṇavāra*
2. Ps: 107 + 59 = 166 *bhāṇavāra*
3. Spk: 78 + 59 = 137 *bhāṇavāra*
4. Mp: 94 + 59 = 153 *bhāṇavāra*

V. At the very end the merit made by composing the commentaries is transferred to the whole world.

<sup>401</sup> A Saṃghathera is the senior most monk (at least in Ceylon or South India at the time), such as the president of the second council Sabbakāmī, Vin II 303,27; cf. v. Hinüber 1996.

The texts end with the “Buddhaghosa colophon” identical in all four commentaries and Vism, where also his place of origin (?) Moraṇḍakheṭaka<sup>402</sup> is found.

**228.** Sv begins with an introduction common to all four Nikāya-commentaries<sup>403</sup>, which is largely identical with the historical introduction to Sp (§ 212). The history ends in Sv already with the first council held at Rājagaha, because the second one held at Vesālī concerned only matters of the Vinaya.

The events immediately before the first council, when Ānanda gained the Arahantship (Vin II 286,9–15), are related twice. The second report is ascribed to the Majjhimbhāṇakas (Sv 11,3–11,11 = Sp 12,17–13,3), while the first (Sv 10,19–11,2) may be the one of the Dīghabhāṇakas. If so, different Bhāṇakas had slightly different historical traditions<sup>404</sup>.

The central figure of the council is of course Ānanda as the first monk to recite the Nikāyas, who is instructed by the council to hand the Nikāyas down to:

I. MN: disciples of the deceased Sāriputta; II. SN: Mahākassapa, III. AN: Anuruddha<sup>405</sup>, while Ānanda himself keeps DN. This seems to be the legend of the beginnings of the *bhāṇaka*-tradition.

**229.** In contrast to Sp the Nikāya-commentaries normally do not contain many deliberations; the orthodox interpretation is simply communicated. Heretical opinions are not discussed<sup>406</sup> in contrast to Sp, where diverging opinions are examined before a decision on a legal problem is reached.

One of the rare discussions concerns a reference to a Jātaka, which was not unanimously accepted (Sv 483,10 sq.).

**230.** There are, however, certain theoretical considerations on the explanation of Suttantas common to all four commentaries. Thus the principle of *apubbavaṇṇanā*, Sv 71,19 has been used here as in Sp (cf. § 214).

<sup>402</sup> The exact form of this place name of unknown location is doubtful.

<sup>403</sup> The other commentaries refer back to Sv: Ps I 2,32–36; Spk I 3,2–6; Mp I 3,10–15.

<sup>404</sup> Cf. the different tables of contents for the Khuddakanikāya: § 85.

<sup>405</sup> Cf. CPD (1933) s.v. Anuruddha, where this information is explained correctly. In spite of this, it seems to have been misunderstood by Migot 1954: 481.

<sup>406</sup> This is done only in Kv: § 144 sq.

Typical for the Nikāya-commentaries are the “four reasons for the laying down of a Suttanta” (*suttanikkhepa*, Sv 50,20–51,29 = Ps I 15,20–16,22 = Spk II 3,16–4,25 = Mp I 19,18–20,2, cf. § 253, 256, 278, 299):

1. *attajjhāsaya* “one’s own wish” (CPD)
2. *parajjhāsaya* “the wish of another person”
3. *pucchāvasika* “due to a question”
4. *aṭṭhuppattika* “due to an occasion” (CPD)

The *suttanikkhepas* are illustrated by examples and conclude the commentaries on the introduction (*nidāna*) to the respective first Suttantas, in which the first sentence beginning with *evaṃ me sutam ...* (§ 53)<sup>407</sup> is discussed in great detail. It is remarkable that the *suttanikkhepas* are defined in Spk at the beginning of the Nidānavagga commentary, which shows that the sharp break between this and the Sagāthavagga (§ 74) was already felt at the time of Buddhaghosa.

In commenting on the four *mahāpadesas* (§ 9), a controversy on what is to be understood as a Suttanta, is communicated (Sv 565,32–566,30) and the Thera Sudinna is quoted postulating: “all the Buddha word (that is including the Vinaya) is Suttanta” (Sv 566,7). The whole paragraph is repeated in Mp III 158,21–160,16 in the commentary on the Catukkanipāta. Only in Sv, however, a Pakiṇṇaka is added containing the *mahāpadesas* of the Vinaya (Sv 567,2–568,6), which have been developed by the Vinaya experts (Sp 230,27–233,2) in analogy to those found already in the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta (DN II 123,30–126,5), further:

1. *sutta* : “the whole Vinayapiṭaka” (Sp 230,32, cf. Sp 769,3 where Vin II 138,22sq. is quoted as *sutta*): “the whole Tipiṭaka” (Sv 567,34) (!)
2. *suttānuloma* “analogous to the canonical text” (Sp 213,1 sq. based on Vin I 250,34–251,6: “*mahāpadesa*”).
3. *ācariyavāda* “teaching of those participating in the councils” (*dharmasaṅgāhaka*, Sp 231,9) cf. Sp 1103,27; 1104,11 sq.

<sup>407</sup> Sv 26,17–33,32; Ps I 3,2–10,4; Spk I 4,5–12,4; Mp I 4,3–14,2, cf. Ud-a 6,4–25,13, cf. Lamotte 1949a: 80–114; similarly on *bhagavā*, Sv 33,33–34,11 = Ps I 10,5–28 = Spk I 12,5–30 = Mp I 4,3–28, cf. Lamotte 1949a: 115–126, or *viharati*, Ps I 10,35–11,7 = Spk I 13,1–8; Mp I 15,3–10 etc.

4. *attano mati* “one’s own opinion” (Sp 231,11: “inferred [*anumānena*] by one’s own intellect according to guidelines [*nayaggāhena*]”, cf. *ayaṃ therassa manoratho*, As 267,1)

This discussion is found neither in Spk nor in Ps, but only once in each “subunit” (§ 227).

231. When explaining the text of the Tipiṭaka, the commentaries may simply give the meaning of single words: *aṇuṃ thūlaṃ* (DN I 223,8\*) *ti khuddakaṃ mahantaṃ*, Sv 393,3 or: *uppannaṃ hotī* (DN I 224,10) *ti jātaṃ hoti*, Sv 395,9. In both instances extremely common words such as “minute, large, born” are explained by synonyms, which are perhaps retranslations from the Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā(?). Astonishingly, both occur in sections marked as *anuttānavaṇṇanā* “explanation of unclear words(?!)” (Sv 388,4; 395,4).

Some of these glosses read as if quoted from a dictionary: *māṇavo* (DN I 1,9) *ti satto pi coro pi taruṇo pi*, Sv 36,6, which is indeed later used by the Abhidhānappadīpika 842 (cf. Sadd 508,21–25)<sup>408</sup>. This important evidence for early Indian lexicography has so far escaped the attention of scholars<sup>409</sup>.

At the same time the usage of the word *māṇava* is demonstrated by examples from the Tipiṭaka confirmed by the commentaries: *māṇavehī* (AN III 102,10) *ti corehi*, Mp III 271,3 etc. These examples seem to have been common knowledge to all commentators as shown by the explanation of the pronoun *vo* “you” also provided with numerous examples (Ps I 18,14–24), and referred to at Sp 485,28 sq. as if universally known.

232. Occasionally the same word is not explained in a uniform manner. Comparing the definition of *attharaṇa*, *paccattharaṇa* “covering, blanket” at Sp 1086,3–1087,8 ≠ Sv 86,25–88,4 ≠ Mp II 292,27–293,18<sup>410</sup> it is evident that the Nikāya-commentaries take over the wording of Sp as this concerns legal matters, but they add the opinion of “some” (*keci*) who allow much more luxurious blankets than does the Vinaya, a fact that still worries later Vinaya commentaries<sup>411</sup>.

<sup>408</sup> Cf. the “lexicon verses”: Ps II 27,22\*–24; Paṭi-a 12,21\*–24; 13,13\*–16\*; 14,17\*–21\* (§ 293) and the much later Ap-a 99,10\*–18.

<sup>409</sup> On the earliest indigenous dictionaries: Vogel 1979: 309; on a possible date: § 293, cf. § 450.

<sup>410</sup> Cf. Ps II 39,12–22 = Spk II 325,13 ≠ Sv 86,26–87,2; 87,21–88,1.

<sup>411</sup> Vjb 477,17–22, cf. Sp-ṭ III 295,5–13 takes it to be said to please laymen; cf. also Vism 41,11–14.

Sometimes explanations of the same word vary even within the same commentary e.g. *suttantā kavikatā kāveyyā* ..., SN II 267,11 = AN I 72,30 = AN III 107,19 is explained in one way at Spk II 229,3–13 = Mp II 146,19–147,8, but differently at Mp III 272,5–17: The AN references are found in the Duka- and Pañcaka-Nipāta respectively, which may be the reason for the difference. This is because individual Nipātas still have separate traditions, as manuscripts often contain the basic text of only one Nipāta together with the respective commentary. If texts were handed down in this manner at an early date this would easily explain why two different redactors were at work or why two different traditions were adopted from the old Aṭṭhakathā.

Opinions on single words varied at the time of the Aṭṭhakathā: *arañña* is defined differently in Vinaya and Abhidhamma (Sp 301,11) and differently again in Suttanta (Vism 72,11–19)<sup>412</sup>.

233. Syntactical and grammatical problems are clarified<sup>413</sup> in a terminology which allows the conclusion that the Pāṇinian system was familiar to the commentators<sup>414</sup>.

234. Side by side with remarks on the meaning of words there are also “encyclopaedic” explanations as in: *sakuṇaṇ* (DN I 222,25) *ti kākam vā kulalam vā*, Sv 392,25 “bird means crow or hawk (? meaning uncertain)”. Here the commentary actually quotes an old formula (2+2+3) from the canon: *gijjhā pi kākā pi kulalā pi*, SN II 255,13 = Vin III 105,16 (Spk II 217,12 = Sp 507,13). These formulas seem to have found their way into the commentaries frequently via the Niddesa (§ 117). At the same time they can hardly belong to the old Aṭṭhakathā, because such explanations rule out the possibility that they were translated from Sinhalese.

235. Often, long digressions are connected to key words such as: *bhad-dakappe*, DN II 1,27, which induces the commentator at Sv 410,21–425,15 to give a detailed description of the life of the Buddha

<sup>412</sup> CPD s.v. *arañña*, vol. I, p. 414a (bottom); cf. *sambahula*, Sv 42,33–43,2 = Ps II 54,11–15 = Spk II 168,13–16 = Ud-a 102,15–17 (§ 257 note 452; § 286) and Norman 1987 on *sabbato pabham*.

<sup>413</sup> E.g. Sv 396,26–28.

<sup>414</sup> Pind 1989, 1990, cf. v. Hinüber 1987: 119 sq.

using a fixed set of *pariccheda*s “sections” such as *bodhi-pariccheda* “section on enlightenment” etc. (Sv 421,29–33) (cf. § 299).

In Mp, long hagiographical texts have been preserved in commenting on the different groups of prominent persons (§ 79): 42 Theras: Mp I 148–337; 13 Therīs: Mp I 337–381; 10 laymen: Mp I 382–401; 10 laywomen: Mp I 401–458.

236. Another digression is the story on the birth of the king Ajātasattu (Sv 133,30–139,6), where the commentary refers to the Vinaya (cf. Vin II 184, 30 sq.). A similar text on king Mandhātā is ascribed to the Aṭṭhakathācariyas (Sv 481,8–483,7 = Ps I 225,6–227,12).

Small additions to the canonical texts such as *evaṃ etaṃ bhūtapubban ti*, DN II 167,21 (§ 54) are regarded as a kind of supplement (cf. § 65) added during the third council (Sv 615,14) in this particular case or even later: *Tambapaṇṇittherehi vuttā*, Sv 615,17 “(these verses [DN II 167,22\*–168,4\*]) have been spoken by Ceylonese elders ” (cf. Sv 646,19).

237. A unique remark is made at the end of DN no.14 Mahāpadānasuttanta (DN II 1,4–54,7). The canonical text is supposed to be an abbreviated version of three *bhāṇavāra* (Sv 480,9 sq.)<sup>415</sup>, which can be expanded to 21 or even 2600 (!) *bhāṇavāra*,<sup>416</sup> and consequently this is the *suttantarājā*, Sv 480,16.

238. Suttanta titles mentioned at the beginning of each section: *evaṃ me sutam ... ti Sabbāsavasuttam*, Ps I 59,25 are used for reference to the canonical text explained in Sv and in Ps.

The practice of Spk and Mp is quite different. Due to the enormous number of Suttantas in the basic texts (§ 48), these are counted: *nandanavaggassa paṭhame. tatrā ti ...*, Spk I 29,9 “the first (Suttanta) in the Nandana section. There means ...” or: *dutiyaṃ paṭhame. eka-dhamman ti ...*, Mp I 29,12.

This pattern is interrupted at the end of the long section on hagiography in Mp (§ 235), where the basic text is quoted in a unique way: *aṭṭhānapāliyaṃ aṭṭhānan ti ...*, Mp II 1,6 (*ad* AN I 26,30), cf. Mp II 18,23 (*ad* AN I 30,20): “in the canonical text (called) ‘impossible’: impossible means ...”. No parallel to this way of quoting the basic

<sup>415</sup> On expanding texts cf. § 70, 144.

<sup>416</sup> The length of DN is 64 *bhāṇavāra*.



text can be traced in the Aṭṭhakathā<sup>417</sup>. Therefore, this was perhaps the manner to quote the canon used in the old Aṭṭhakathā, which the redactors forgot to change here at the end of a very long digression.

239. The aim to convey a certain basic knowledge entails parallel passages in the commentaries as for example on the daily routine of the Buddha, which should be common knowledge to all monks: Sv 45,17–48,2 = Spk I 243,33–246,22 = Mp I 64,4–67,2<sup>418</sup>.

More interesting for the structure of the Aṭṭhakathā are those parallel texts which are used in explanations of equally parallel passages in the Tipiṭaka.

All four Nikāyas contain the ten *sikkhāpadas* and all four commentaries attach some importance to their detailed explanation. In addition, they are discussed in the Atthasālinī (cf. § 313). The following table is meant to give a rough idea about the interrelation of the respective texts<sup>419</sup>. It should be used side by side with the respective editions<sup>420</sup>:

Basic texts:

DN I 4,1–5,3

MN I 45,7–17

SN II 168,2–17

Commentaries:

I. Sv 69,20–70,5

Ps I 198,9–16

Spk II 144,18–145,2

intermediate text

II. Sv 71,16–33

Ps I 198,17–199,10

Spk II 154,3–145,18

III. (DN: text differs)

Ps I 199,11–199,28

Spk II 145,19–145,6

IV. Sv 72,15–73,4

Ps I 200,1–200,21

Spk II 146,6–146,21

(additional text in Sv: Sv 73,4–9)

V. Sv 73,32–74,15 etc.

Ps I 200,21–203,9

Spk II 146,22–149,26

Here ends the continuous parallel in the basic text and the Nikāya-commentaries.

<sup>417</sup> Cf. the use of key words in Sp (§ 216) and the unusual (older?) method to quote Jātakas in Bhārhut such as *Yavamajhakiyaṃ jatakam*: Lüders 1941: 139, cf. also Nidd II 80,6sq.

<sup>418</sup> Not yet traced in Ps, but cf. Pj II 131,24–134,17.

<sup>419</sup> A detailed study on the structure of the Aṭṭhakathā is under preparation and will discuss the parallels in detail.

<sup>420</sup> The ten *sikkhāpadas* are referred to by Roman figures: I. *pāṇātipāta* “murder”, II. *adinnaḍāna* “theft” etc. For texts, where they are enumerated see § 20.

This relates to the Atthasālinī as follows:

1. (*sikkhāpada* I–X):

Ps I 198,9–203,9      Spk II 144,18–149,26      As 97,13–102,31

After different intermediate texts inserted in all commentaries the parallel continues:

2. Ps I 203,25–204,25      Spk II 149,28–151,3      As 102,38–104,3  
intermediate text in Ps

3. Ps I 204,30–205,18      Spk II 151,4–151,25      As 104,4–104,27

The individual elements, from which this passage has been built can be recognized easily because they are separated by the intermediate texts. Moreover, at the end of the explanation of I. *pāṇātipāta* there is a reference to Sp for a more detailed explanation: Sv 70,4; Ps I 198,26; Spk II 145,1, which is repeated at the end of other paragraphs, too. These repetitions make sense only, if the individual paragraphs were originally conceived as separate units which could be inserted wherever needed. Where no such concluding sentence exists, the seams between individual parts very often show that, and how, prefabricated texts have been fitted into the context.

Moreover, the ten *sikkhāpadās* are found and commented upon even twice in AN: AN I 211,17–212,32 with Mp II 324,30–327,29 and AN II 208,33–209,33 with Mp III 188,13–195,4. If the comments in Mp are compared in detail to those in Sv and Spk it becomes evident that the intermediate text found in Sv after I. etc. (see table above), but not in Spk, can be traced in Mp:

I. Sv 69,20–70,5 = Spk II 144,18–145,2

intermediate text: Sv 70,6–71,15 = Mp II 324,31–325,24

II. Sv 71,16–71,33 = Spk II 145,3–145,18

intermediate text: Sv 72,1–14 = Mp II 325,27–326,9 etc.

As Mp comments very briefly on the terms *pāṇātipāta* etc., which are dealt with at length in Spk, it is possible to combine the text of both Spk and Mp and end up with the text in Sv.

240. Once these parallels are analysed, it seems obvious that the redactors used palm leaf slips for certain key words to be used in each of the four commentaries on the Nikāyas<sup>421</sup>. This would guarantee that

<sup>421</sup> The use of slips (*patṭrikā*) is attested by Jayaratha commenting in the early 13th century on Ruyyaka: *Alaṃkārasarvasva* (Kāvyamālā no. 35 [1939]: 86,137), cf. Jacobi 1908/1969: 291/165.

all contained the same information in uniform wording as an additional guarantee for the orthodoxy of the content.

Thus the plan the Nikāya-commentaries follow, differs widely from the one used for Sp. In the Nikāya-commentaries texts are duplicated deliberately to make every single commentary, combined with Vism, independent from the other three. In this manner they stand like four separate columns of orthodoxy on the same firm foundation formed by Vism.

Sp, on the other hand, avoids parallels and refers the user to other sections of the same commentary, where a problem has been discussed or a case decided.

241. There are however parallels between Sp and the Nikāya-commentaries. The foundation of the order of nuns has been related in Culavagga X (Vin II 253,17–256,32) and in the Aṅguttaranikāya (AN IV 274,3–277,18). The Vinaya-commentary is very brief here (Sp 1290,26–1291,26) and refers the reader back to the commentary on the 21. Pācittiya (Sp 792, 11–800,19), while Mp IV 132,2–137,12 refers its readers to Sp (Mp IV 136,5) for a full technical explanation on the *garudhammas* “strict rules” prescribed only for nuns.

It is interesting to compare these two commentaries on parallel passages in the canon because of their differences: While Sp hardly mentions the introductory story this is dealt with at length in Mp: Sp 1290,26–1291,2 : Mp IV 132,28–134,20 explaining words and phrases nowhere commented in Sp. The explanation on the eight *garudhammas*, however, is very brief in Mp IV 134,21 sq. Neither key words nor the explanations correspond to Sp 792,1 sq. Consequently, it is very unlikely that Sp simply abbreviated the text as found in Mp at present. On the other hand both commentaries run parallel in the frames of the story and in the explanation of the famous similes on the disastrous effects expected to occur after admitting women to the Saṃgha. Thus both used the same source.

The Vinaya commentary, however, omits the explanation on the *garudhammas* in the Culavagga-commentary, because they are discussed according to the latest insights of the legal experts in commenting on the 31. Pācittiya. Thus a repetition of the perhaps outdated text as preserved in Mp was uncalled for.

If this assumption is correct, Sp has abbreviated, while Mp might have kept the full text of the old Aṭṭhakathā attached to the account

on the foundation of the order of nuns originally common to both Cullavagga and Aṅguttaranikāya. Thus a piece of the old Vinaya-Aṭṭhakathā might survive in this particular case in the commentary on the Aṅguttaranikāya.

**242.** The overall plan comprising Sp and the four Nikāya-commentaries together with and presupposing Vism was conceived at the time of Buddhaghosa, who seems to have been the master mind keeping this huge and admirable project together<sup>422</sup>. As demonstrated for Sp (§ 215), the structure of the old Aṭṭhakathā was changed to a large extent, if not almost completely in this commentary, but perhaps also in those on the Nikāyas, which are called Aṭṭhakathāsāra “essence of the (old) Aṭṭhakathā” (Ps I 109,15\* etc.), which seems to point at an abbreviation.

**243.** The complex structure of the new Aṭṭhakathā has been handled very skillfully and with great care in spite of an occasional awkwardness when fitting prefabricated pieces together.

The best proof of a careful redaction are the numerous cross references which were inserted with much deliberation as just one out of innumerable examples taken from the parallel commentary on the (Mahā)-Satipaṭṭhānasuttantas (DN no. 22, DN II 290–315; MN no. 10, MN I 55–63) shows (Sv 741–806 : Ps I 225–302): When *rūpa*- and *arūpa-kammaṭṭhāna*, Sv 774,24 are discussed, the commentary simply refers back to the Sakkapañña-commentary (Sv 721,35–724,15), where the relevant information is given. Ps on the other hand has not yet explained these concepts and consequently has to do this here:

Sv 774,2: refers to Sakkapañña	Ps I 275,30
Sakkapañña-ct.: Sv 721,35–724,15	Ps I 275,30–278,14
Sv 744,27	Ps I 278,15

Thus the text as found in Ps reads as if it was a combination of two different paragraphs in Sv.

Therefore, the cross references were not incorporated into the prefabricated parts, but added wherever necessary, only when a text was inserted into a certain commentary.

<sup>422</sup> It would be interesting to compare the Aṭṭhakathā to other commentaries composed in ancient India. This is however impossible at present because the commentaries are a badly neglected field of research.

244. It is interesting to ask who wrote these large texts which were used in different commentaries. As they very often deal with matters of dogma, Buddhaghosa does not seem to be an unlikely guess. A detailed comparison with *Vism* therefore seems to be a rewarding task.

Another problem is finding out who put the texts together, because the commentaries are not totally uniform and too voluminous to assume only one person at work<sup>423</sup>. For this purpose linguistic peculiarities could be used which are found sometimes and seem to be limited to one commentary or the other. Moreover, texts not repeated such as the hagiography in *Mp* (§ 235) should be investigated. These are only some of the many tasks for future research on the commentaries.

### V.2.2 *Vimuttimaggā* and *Visuddhimaggā*

**Vimuttimaggā (Vim: 2.8.0):** Edition: Indian original lost<sup>424</sup>; Translation: *The Path of Freedom* by the Arahant Upatissa. Translated into Chinese by Tipiṭaka Saṅghapāla of Funan. Translated from the Chinese by N.R.M.Ehara, Soma Thera and Kheminda Thera. Colombo 1961 (repr. 1995) [trsl. in 1936].

**Visuddhimaggā (Vism: 2.8.1):** Editions: C.A.F.Rhys Davids 1920/1; *Visuddhimaggā of Buddhaghosācariya* Edited by H.C.Warren, Revised by D.Kosambi. Cambridge/Mass. 1950. HOS 41 [foreword dated 1927]; N: *Visuddhimaggā of Buddhaghosācariya* by Dhammananda Kosambi. Bombay I (1940), II (1943) [II: *Visuddhimaggadīpikā*<sup>425</sup>]; *Buddhaghosācariya's Visuddhimaggā* with *Paramatthamañjūsāṭīkā* of Bhadantācariya Dhammapāla. Benares I (1969), II (1969), III (1972) (§ 361); translations: *Visuddhi-Maggā oder der Weg zur Reinheit. Die größte und älteste systematische Darstellung des Buddhismus. Zum ersten Male aus dem Pāli übersetzt von Nyanatiloka.* 1927. Konstanz <sup>2</sup>1952<sup>426</sup>; *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimaggā)*

<sup>423</sup> The length in printed pages in E<sup>c</sup> is approximately: Sp: 1400, Sv + Ps + Spk + Mp: 5000, Vism: 700, altogether more than 7000 pages.

<sup>424</sup> The "Pāli-Vim" which appeared in Ceylon in 1963 is a modern retranslation of texts from Bapat 1937: Endo 1983 and Bechert 1989, who also draws attention to the *Amatākaravappanā*, an unedited Pāli text in verses on meditation.

<sup>425</sup> This is a modern commentary by the editor.

<sup>426</sup> Nyanatiloka rightly criticizes the older translation by Pe Maung Tin (1923–1931): "unbelievably faulty, bristles with misunderstandings", p. XII.

by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa. Translated from the Pāli by Ñāṇamoli. Colombo <sup>2</sup>1964.

Commentary: **Visuddhimaggamahāṭīkā** (**Vism-mhṭ**: 2.8.1,1): S° I (1925), II (1926), III (1927); B° I, II (1962) (cf. § 361).

Subcommentary: **Visuddhimaggacullaṭīkā** (**[Vism-ṭ]**: 2.8.1,22): Edition: S° I, II (2525: 1982); J.Abe: **Visuddhimaggacullaṭīkā**: *Sīla-Dhutaṅga. A Study of the First and Second Chapters of the Visuddhimaggā and Its Commentary*. Poona 1981 [contains also an edition of the respective chapters].

Gaṇṭhipada: **Visuddhimaggagaṇṭhipada** (**Vism-gp**: 2.8.1,01): **Visuddhimaggagaṇṭhi** Edited by P. Devananda, Panadura/Ceylon 1954.

245. According to the concluding verses, *Vism* is to be understood as a summary of all five (!) *Nikāyas* and the *Aṭṭhakathā* (*Vism* 711,19\*).

The story of its origin is told in *Mhv* (§ 207). Contrary to the tradition, however, *Vism* had a predecessor, which is extant only in Chinese<sup>427</sup> and partly in Tibetan translations<sup>428</sup>: the *Vimuttimaggā* by an otherwise unknown *Upatissa*.

As *Nyanatiloka* had noticed already, *Buddhaghosa* really knew and used *Vim*: *Vism-mhṭ* states that *ekacce*, *Vism* 102,31 refers to *Upatissa*, and the relevant sentence is indeed found in *Vim*<sup>429</sup>. Already *Vim* uses older sources and like *Vism* quotes from the old *Aṭṭhakathā*, by lucky coincidence once even the same passage: *Vism* 180,32–181,28 corresponds to *Vim* 132 (*Ehara*)<sup>430</sup>. Moreover, *Vim* also uses the *The-ravāda Tipiṭaka*.

246. Both *Vim* and *Vism* begin with a verse (*Vim*: DN II 123,6\*sq. = AN II 2,1\* sq.; *Vism*: S I 13,20\*sq.) containing the central concepts to be described in the following text: These are in *Vism* *sīla, samādhi* and *paññā*.

The structure of *Vism* has been investigated in detail by *Frauwaller*: The centre piece is the chapter on *samādhi*, which covers half

<sup>427</sup> *Hōbōgirin*, Fascicule Annexe 1978: Taisho no. 1648 translated by *Saṅghabhara* (?) (460–520). The reconstruction of the Skt. form of both the name of the author and the title are uncertain; cf. *Skilling* 1994: 171–173

<sup>428</sup> *Bapat* 1964.

<sup>429</sup> *Vim* trsl. *Ehara* p. 57.

<sup>430</sup> On further texts of this kind in *Vim* and *Vism*: *Bapat* 1937: XXIV sq.

the text of *Vism* and is based on the meditation as described in *Dhs*. By adding *sīla* and *paññā*, a complete handbook for the path to liberation was composed<sup>431</sup>.

247. The content of *Vism* thus continues the old *Abhidhamma* texts, although the form has changed as there is no longer a *Mātikā* at the beginning, but a verse. This was felt to be unusual for a Pāli text by *Dhammapāla*, who justifies the verse at the beginning by pointing out that *Vism* is neither a commentary such as *Sv* nor a treatise (*pakarāṇa*) such as the *Abhidhammāvātāra* (§ 340), but something “in the middle” (*Vism-mhṭ* N° I 2,18) thus alluding to the *nigamana* (§ 226).

248. The last part of *Vism* on *paññā* is based on the *Ñāṇakathā* of *Paṭis*, an earlier handbook (§ 120)<sup>432</sup>. In this connection it may be worth while to recall that a *Ñāṇodayaṃ nāma pakaraṇaṃ*, *Mhv* XXXVII 225 (§ 207) is ascribed to *Buddhaghosa* as an early work about which nothing else is known. Perhaps this was some kind of study preliminary to *Vism* possibly more closely connected to *Paṭis*(??).

On the other hand *Nett* seems to be unknown to *Buddhaghosa*, who quotes *Peṭake*, *Vism* 141,13 once. The respective text is not found in *Peṭ* (§ 171).

249. *Vism* is however closely connected to the *Nikāya*-commentaries including *Sp*<sup>433</sup>. Moreover, *Vism* seems to quote from the old *Aṭṭhakathā*<sup>434</sup> much more extensively than the commentaries do (cf. § 227). This offers rare opportunities for some insights into the structure of the old *Aṭṭhakathā*, e.g. when it is said: *ācayo nāma nibbati upacayo nāma vadḍhi santati nāma pavatti*, *Vism* 449,16–18<sup>435</sup>. For this shows that key words were quoted by *nāma*, that is, in the same way as occasionally in the *Vibhaṅga*-commentary of the *Vinaya*, and not by *iti* as in the new *Aṭṭhakathā* (cf. § 261)<sup>436</sup>.

<sup>431</sup> Frauwallner 1972: 126,132, cf. Bapat 1937: XXI sq..

<sup>432</sup> Frauwallner 1972: 130.

<sup>433</sup> Cf. *Vism* 72,1 with *Sp* 299,4.

<sup>434</sup> E.g. *Vism* 180,32–181,28.

<sup>435</sup> Cf. the quotation from the *Mahāaṭṭhakathā*: *gharaṇaṃ nāma gharūpacāro nāma ...*, *Sp* 299,26 (cf. *Vin* III 46,23).

<sup>436</sup> As *Mp* II 273–15–17 *ad* *AN* I 173,14 shows, *iti* also could have been used, cf. *Kv* 26,20, which the old *Aṭṭhakathā* seems to have quoted.

In an equally rare instance a particular word has been ascribed explicitly to the vocabulary of the old Aṭṭhakathā<sup>437</sup>: *atippiyasahāyo* ... *yo aṭṭhakathāyaṃ soṇḍasahāyo ti vutto*, Vism 316,6sq. “a very dear companion ... one who in the commentaries is called a ‘boon companion’” (Ñāṇamoli). This is all the more interesting as this word obviously belongs to the colloquial language.

In addition to the old Aṭṭhakathā, the Vism has made use of the Bhāṇaka-traditions which are quoted and evaluated<sup>438</sup>.

250. This is a step beyond not only Paṭiṣ, which does not use the old commentary, but also beyond Vim, where the Theravāda tradition does not seem to be examined in as much detail as in Vism. Perhaps this fact can be used for a relative chronology. If Paṭiṣ was composed in the second century AD (§ 119), and if Vism was created about 400 AD (§ 207), Vim should be placed within these brackets perhaps nearer to Vism than to Paṭiṣ at the end of the “crisis of Pāli studies” (§ 206). In case the connection with the Abhayagirivihāra is correct<sup>439</sup>, one might even speculate that Vim was written when this monastery enjoyed strong royal support under Mahāsenā (334–361/274–301).

While Vism became a most successful book in Theravāda countries, Vim seems to have enjoyed a much higher international reputation in the Buddhist world, for the book was known and used still by Daśabalaśrīmitra in 12th century Bengal then under Sena rule<sup>440</sup>.

### V.2.3 The Commentaries on the Khuddakanikāya

251. In spite of the fact that the colophon to Vism mentions five Nikāyas (§ 245), no commentary of the fifth Nikāya was composed by Buddhaghosa. Even those ascribed to him are not included into the network closely connecting the commentaries on the first four Nikāyas and Vism.

The Khuddakanikāya-commentaries have been written by different commentators:

<sup>437</sup> Cf. Sp-ṭ on *lekhanadaṇḍappamāṇa*: CPD s.v. *kaniṭṭhaṅguliparimāṇa* and § 317.

<sup>438</sup> E.g. Vism 275,18 sq.

<sup>439</sup> On the possible Abhayagirivihāra affiliation of Vim: Skilling 1993b, 135–140 and 1994a: 199–202.

<sup>440</sup> Skilling 1987: 7, 15.



1. Khp : Paramatthajotikā I (ascribed to Buddhaghosa)
2. Dhp: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (ascribed to Buddhaghosa)
3. Ud: Paramatthadīpanī I: Dhammapāla
4. It: Paramatthadīpanī II: Dhammapāla
5. Sn: Paramatthajotikā II (ascribed to Buddhaghosa)
6. Vv: Paramatthadīpanī III: Dhammapāla
7. Pv: Paramatthadīpanī IV: Dhammapāla
8. Th: Paramatthadīpanī V: Dhammapāla
9. Thī: Paramatthadīpanī VI: Dhammapāla
10. Ja: Jātakatthavaṇṇanā (ascribed to Buddhaghosa)
11. Nidd: Saddhammapajotikā: Upasena
12. Paṭis: Saddhammapakāsinī: Mahānāma
13. Ap: Visuddhajanavilāsinī: (anonymous)
14. Bv: Madhuratthavilāsinī: Buddhaddatta
15. Cp: Paramatthadīpanī VII: Dhammapāla

Within these commentaries the Paramatthadīpanī of Dhammapāla forms the largest unit<sup>441</sup>, while some subgroups are connected by similar titles:

1. Pj I, II: -jotikā
2. Nidd-a, Paṭis-a: Saddhamma-
3. Ap-a, Bv-a: -vilāsinī
4. Ja, Dhp-a: (without title).

### V.2.3.1 Paramatthajotikā I

**Paramatthajotikā I (Pj I: 2.5.1,1):** Edition and Translation together with Khp, q.v.; Index: Pj II Vol. III, p. 800–860 and additional variants: *ibidem* p. 863–881.

**252.** The title Paramatthajotikā “Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning” (Ñāṇamoli) is mentioned at the beginning (Pj I 11,7), which is in prose in contrast to the commentaries on the first Nikāyas. Neither initiator nor author are named in the following verses nor is any reference made to either earlier commentaries or even to the Mahāvihāra.

As is usual in the beginning of a set of commentaries, Pj I also contains a brief survey of the Tipiṭaka (Pj I 12,1–11) as the first com-

<sup>441</sup> A continuous sequence of the texts commented upon by Dhammapāla is found in the Khuddakagantha of the Dīgha- and Majjhima-bhāṇakas: § 85.

mentary on the Khuddakanikāya<sup>442</sup>. Then follows an explanation of the term *nikāya*<sup>443</sup>, which is alien to the four Nikāya-commentaries<sup>444</sup>.

An *aṭṭhavaṇṇanāya mātikā* “summary of the explanation” (Pj I 13,14, cf. § 256) outlines the methods to be applied in Pj I, which are similar to those in Sp (§ 212).

253. Because Khp is a composite texts (§ 86), Pj I largely duplicates other commentaries, particularly Pj II<sup>445</sup>:

V. Maṅgalasutta: Sn 258–269: Pj I 88,27–157,10 = Pj II 300,1–30<sup>446</sup>

VI. Ratanasutta: Sn 222–238: Pj I 157,14–201,6 = Pj II 193,15–21

IX. Mettasutta: Sn 143–152: Pj I 231,6–252,20 : Pj II 278,2–12

Though there are also parallels to Khp I–IV, Pj I does not strictly follow the respective commentaries. The only really independent part of Pj I is the explanation of VIII. Nidhikaṇḍa (Pj I 216,11–231,2).

254. The form of Pj I differs widely from the one of the four Nikāya-commentaries and therefore it does not seem commendable to ascribe it to Buddhaghosa<sup>447</sup>.

The commentaries on the individual parts of Khp are shaped as separate and independent units as seen best in the beginning of VIII. Nidhikaṇḍa.

Moreover, Pj I uses a technical vocabulary different from Sv etc.: Instead of *suttanikkhepa* (§230) Pj I has *atthuppatti* and *nikkhepappajjana* (Pj I 75,23–25) or in VIII. Nidhikaṇḍa *nikkhepakāraṇa* (Pj I 216,17).

There is no reference to Vism in Pj I. Because the one given in the edited text Pj I 185,30 is found only in Pj II manuscripts, while those of Pj I refer to IV. Kumārapañha (Pj I 81,10–82,5). Because this cross reference is impossible in Pj II, it has been changed there to Vism (cf. § 257).

Even where obvious, Pj I does not extract texts from Vism. The explanation of III. Dvattiṃsākāra (Pj I 38,25 sqq.), which are also

<sup>442</sup> So do Sp, Sv, and Ud-a as Paramatthadīpanī I.

<sup>443</sup> On Skt. influence in this explanation: Pj I-trsl. p. 311 s.v. “Sanskrit allusions”

<sup>444</sup> Cf. *nikāya: āgama*, Mp II 189,17.

<sup>445</sup> More than half the text of Pj I is identical with Pj II.

<sup>446</sup> Parallel texts are given in full in B\*, but not in E\* of Pj II, which of course comments upon the complete text of Sn: erroneously Sn-trsl II (1992), p. XXXVIII § 38.

<sup>447</sup> Cf. also Pind 1990: 199 note 59.

dealt with at length in Vism 241,3 sqq., are commented in a wording of different structure (§ 295).

Although IV. Kumārapāṇha is abbreviated from AN V 50,22–54,13; 55,23–57,31, the commentary (Pj I 75,23–88,23) is in no way related to Mp V 21,25–26,2.

In the light of these differences from Buddhaghosa's commentaries it is all the more interesting that VII. Tirokuḍḍa (Pj I 201,10–216,7) corresponds closely to Dhammapāla's Pv-a 19,21–31,11. Unfortunately, however, it seems impossible to give a chronological priority to either text, as both may simply have used the same source (§ 280).

### V.2.3.2 Paramatthajotikā II

**Paramatthajotikā II** ( Pj II: 2.5.5,1): Edition: H.Smith I (1916), II (1917), III (1918).

Subcommentary: [Paramatthajotikā]-Dīpanī (Sn-ṭ: 2.5.5,12): Fragment on Pj II 513,16–548,25 extant as manuscript copied AD 1532, Vat Lai Hin<sup>448</sup>.

**255.** Neither author nor even a title is mentioned in Pj II, where it is simply said: "I shall write a commentary on Sn" (Pj II 1,8\*). Thus, originally Pj II was anonymous, and moreover like Dh-p-a and Ja was without an individual title: Pj might have been chosen at a later date because large parts overlapped with Pj I. This connected this commentary to Pj I (§ 253).

On the whole, however, Pj I and Pj II are so different that it is difficult to imagine a common author<sup>449</sup>.

Although no reference is made to the old Aṭṭhakathā, older sources have been used by Pj II<sup>450</sup>.

Pj II begins with a table of contents of Sn also giving the length of the text as eight *bhānavāras* using the term *pariyattipamāṇato*, Pj II 1,24 where Sv etc. would have said *pāliya*.

**256.** The same *mātikā* on the ways of interpretation is given as in Pj I (§ 252). The *suttanikkhepa* Pj II 46,15 sq.<sup>451</sup> are known to Pj II (cf.

<sup>448</sup> An edition is planned and will appear in JPTS.

<sup>449</sup> A common author had been postulated by Norman 1983: 129, who corrected his view in Norman, Sn-trsl II (1992), p. XXXVIII § 38.

<sup>450</sup> Bechert 1958: 18, cf. § 123.

<sup>451</sup> Cf. Pj II 159,3; 501,27.

§ 230), but the term used for them is *uppatti*. It is unusual that a double *uppatti* is postulated for the Vijayasutta, Sn 193–206 because this text was spoken at two different places (Pj II 241,4).

The arrangement of the commentary on individual Suttantas is quite uniform. As the method of *apubbavaṇṇanā*, Pj II 300,12 (cf. § 214, 293) was followed, the commentary becomes shorter and shorter towards the end.

257. Often Pj II follows Sv etc., e.g., when explaining *evaṃ me sutam* in an abbreviated form (Pj II 135,3–25). It is interesting that Pj II, while commenting on the Maṅgalasutta (Pj II 300,5–8), refers to Ps I 2,32–7,29 for a detailed discussion of *evaṃ me sutam*, while Pj I 100,1–104,15 has a long explanation of this sentence omitted in Pj II together with a lengthy part of the Maṅgalasutta-commentary (Pj I 89–112). This seems to indicate two different authors for Pj I and II. Moreover, the reference to Ps proves that Pj II knew and used the commentaries on the other Nikāyas without, however, simply copying texts. Vism, too, is quoted in Pj II (§ 254).

Some explanations in Pj II differ from those in the four Nikāya-commentaries: The eight *tāpasa* “ascetics” are described differently at Pj II 295,8–296,9 and at Sv 270,19–271,24<sup>452</sup>.

~~258. The end of Sn is commented on in Nidd (§ 116). Thus there is the unique situation that an earlier commentary survives. Pj II 512,22–24 explicitly refers to Nidd in stating that it will give only a brief explanation of what was said in detail there: the corresponding text in Pj II is only one-tenth in length compared to Nidd. Moreover, Nidd was used in other parts of Pj II as well.~~

259. Pj I and Pj II follow different purposes: Pj I is an independent handbook in the same way as Khp, while Pj II is nearer to the four Nikāya-commentaries. Both seem to fill gaps left open by Dhammapāla's Paramatthadīpanī.

Neither Pj I nor Pj II can be dated, not even in relation to each other, except that both presuppose Buddhaghosa. In spite of the “Buddhaghosa colophon” added to both commentaries (Pj I 253,5–17; Pj II 608–8,20) no immediate relation to Buddhaghosa can be recognized.

Both refer to Sīhaḷadīpa in a way that suggests that they were indeed composed in Ceylon.

<sup>452</sup> Cf. *sambhula*, Pj II 313,1 and note 412 above.

## V.2.3.3 Jātakatthavaṇṇanā and Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā

260. Both Ja and Dh-p-a are traditionally ascribed to Buddhaghosa, an assumption which has been rightly questioned by modern research<sup>453</sup>. They are radically different in form from those commentaries dealt with so far, for the explanation of the respective verses is overgrown by stories. Consequently, Ja and Dh-p-a belong to the narrative literature rather than to commentarial literature.

**Jātakatthavaṇṇanā (Ja: 2.5.10,1<sup>454</sup>):** Editions etc. see : Jātaka § 109.

Subcommentary: **Linatthappakāsinī (Ja-pt: 2.5.10,11):** O. v. Hinüber: Two Jātaka Manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok. JPTS 10.1985, 1–22: complete manuscript copied AD 1647, cf. § 358 [Edition: On no. 536 Kuṇāla-ja in Bollée 1970; on no. 540 Sāma-ja in Čičak-Chand 1974, see Jātaka § 109]<sup>455</sup>.

Gaṇṭhipada (in Sinhalese): **Jātaka aṭuvā gaṇṭhipadaya (Ja-gp: 2.5.10,1(4)):** Edition: M. Vimalakīrtisthavira and K. Somindasthavira. Colombo 1961.

261. Ja begins with verses which name three initiators: Atthadassin, Buddhadeva, and Buddhamitta (Ja I 15–19\*)<sup>456</sup> and refer to the Mahāvihāra, Ja I 1,22\*. No title is given except Jātakatthavaṇṇanā “commentary on the Ja”.

There is no *nigamana*, for the verses at the end have been added by a scribe<sup>457</sup>.

Nothing is said in the introductory verses about earlier Ja-commentaries, which can be inferred because of the parallel stories preserved in Buddhaghosa’s commentaries (cf. § 113), which, however, never refer back to the Ja-atthavaṇṇanā.

Sp once mentions a Ja-aṭṭhakathā, which is the earlier commentary used also by Ja in the commentary proper (*veyyākaraṇa*) explaining the *gāthās* and embedded in the stories (§ 112). Usually single words are commented on and variants from the old Aṭṭhakathā quot-

<sup>453</sup> E.g. Winternitz 1912: 153, Dh-p-a-trsl I p. 59, but cf. Norman 1983: 127.

<sup>454</sup> Cf. § 109–115 for a full discussion of the Ja.

<sup>455</sup> On further subcommentaries to Ja: Bollée 1968b: 498.

<sup>456</sup> Buddhamitta follows the *Mahimsāsaka/Mahīśāsaka* school. These initiators are not mentioned in the introduction to S<sup>c</sup> (cf. E<sup>5</sup> Ja IV introduction) which, in fact, is the introduction to Ap-a adopted to the Ja.

<sup>457</sup> Ja VI 594 note.

ed occasionally<sup>458</sup>, once also in the Nidānakathā (§ 111). This seems to indicate that the old Aṭṭhakathā already possessed a similar introduction<sup>459</sup>.

A unique (?) quotation is met with in the prose story of the first Ja (Ja I 99,19–27) most probably from the old Aṭṭhakathā as the word commented on has been referred to by *nāma* (§ 249).

There are rare digressions in the Ja-commentary<sup>460</sup>, and Buddhaghosa's commentaries have been referred to for more detailed explanation occasionally<sup>461</sup>.

**Ja-pṭ** is probably quoted in Maṇis AD 1466 (§ 347).

**Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā (Dhp-a: 2.5.2,1):** Editions: H.C. Norman I,1 (1906), I,2 (1909), II (1911), III (1912), IV (1914), V (1915)<sup>462</sup>; New Edition: H.Smith I<sup>2</sup>,1 (1925 [= Dhp-a I (1906) 1–159 on Dhp 1–20]); translation: E.W.Burlingame I – III (1921)[with an important introduction].

Subcommentaries: Varasambodhi: **Dhammapadaṭṭhikā (Dhp-nṭ: 2.5.2,13)**; Bollée 1968a: 315 [composed AD 1866], S<sup>e</sup> 1992 together with: [Siri Sumaṅgala: **Dhammapaṭṭhakathāgāthāyojanā (Dhp-a-y: 2.5.2, 16)**].

**Gaṇṭhipada (in Sinhalese): Dhampiyā aṭuvā gēṭapadaya (Dhp-a-gp: 2.5.2, 1(4))**: D.B.Jayatilaka 1929–1933; new edition: M.Vimalakīrti Sthavira and K. Sominda Sthavira. Colombo 1960.

**262.** The initiator of the anonymous Dhp-a is the otherwise unknown Thera Kumārakassapa who intended to make the commentary known beyond the Island by a translation from Sinhalese (Dhp-a I2 1,11\*-13\*). Dhp-a does not have a particular title. As in Ja it is simply called *dhammapadassa aṭṭhavaṇṇanā*, Dhp-a IV 234,22.

A survey of contents of Dhp-a is given at the end of the text, which is unusual (Dhp-a IV 234,7–19). As some stories introducing

<sup>458</sup> Cf. Ja VII (index) s.v., which however is not at all complete.

<sup>459</sup> It is likely that *dūrenidāne ... viṭṭhārato ... Jātakaṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttā*, Pj II 2,32 refers to the old Aṭṭhakathā.

<sup>460</sup> On *hiri* and *otappa*, Ja I 129,23'-131,24'.

<sup>461</sup> Ja I 139,23; Mp III 123,5–22; Ja V 38,4; Spk I 281,29 sq. The last reference is, strangely enough, found within a story.

<sup>462</sup> The dates of the original publication given in the PTS reprint of 1970 are partly wrong.

Dhp verses are used repeatedly, their total number is only 299 against 423 verses.

263. Dhp-a is divided into *vatthus* “subjects” (cf. § 216,320). This division seems to have been used already in an earlier Dhp-commentary, for the Mahāpaccarī is quoted as saying *dharmapadam saḥavatthum*, Sp 789,23 “the Dhp together with the Vatthus (i. e. stories)”<sup>463</sup>.

The purpose of these Vatthus is to introduce the Dhp-verses, which are quoted at the beginning of the individual Vatthus<sup>464</sup> as in the Ja (§ 112).

Dhp-a is connected to the Ja by about 60 stories common to both, Dhp-a and Jā, and by cross references: “this is said in detail in the Dukanipāta in the Bahubhāṇijātaka” (Dhp-a IV 92,15) referring to Ja no. 215 Kacchapajātaka (!) (Ja II 175,18–178,3).

264. In contrast to the Ja the joint between prose story and verse is often very awkward, because the contents of both do not really fit together.

The sentence used to mark the transition from prose to verse is occasionally *anusandhiṃ ghaṭetvā*, Dhp-a III 4,6 etc. “having made a connection”. A corresponding wording is used in the Ja only in the very first story (Ja I 104,1–7). Thus Dhp-a seems to have generalized a singular Ja-phrase (cf. CPD s.v. *anusandhi* (b)).

265. The Dhp-verses are followed by a commentary “semi-occasionally ... of some assistance<sup>465</sup>”. At the end it is said that the Buddha successfully used story and verse to achieve his end.

Sometimes appendices were added after the concluding verse as in Dhp-a XXIV,2 Sūkarapotikā-vatthu (Dhp-a IV 46,6–51,24 on Dhp 338–343) which contains a local legend set in the village Bhokkanta south to Anurādhapura at the time of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya and thus connects Dhp-a to Ceylon.

266. The pattern of the Vatthus is followed very strictly even if the result is at times a rather strange composite story as Dhp-a XIII, 10

<sup>463</sup> On this paragraph in Sp: v. Hinüber 1989: 69.

<sup>464</sup> The structure of the Vatthus and the contents of Dhp-a are described: Dhp-a-trsl I 26–29 [§ 5] and I 71–141 respectively. Quotations from the Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā are found in Dhp-gp, cf. note 362.

<sup>465</sup> Dhp-a-trsl I 28.

Asadisadāna-vatthu (Dhp-a III 183,9–189,8 on Dhp 177). Here Sv 653,29–655,32 has been used, which unfortunately quotes Dhp 177 in the middle of the story. To preserve the structure of Dhp-a, the commentator struggles not very successfully to reconstruct the story in such a way that the verse is transferred to the end.

267. In spite of an almost identical wording in parallel stories in the Ja and Dhp-a, the explanations of verses are quite different as demonstrated by the commentaries of Ja no. 201 Bandhanāgāra-ja (Ja II 140,23'–141,18') and Dhpa-a XXIV,4 Bandhanāgāra-vatthu (Dhp-a IV 56,1–57,2) on identical verses. This points to two separate commentarial traditions handed down by the Jātaka- and Dhāmapada-bhāṇakas<sup>466</sup> respectively.

It is of particular interest that Dhp 125 occurs also in SN I 13,13\*–16\* (Spk I 49,5–11) and Ja II 203,15–18\* with three different commentaries.

268. If the prose in Dhp-a and Ja is identical, but, on the other hand, the explanation of the corresponding verses is different, this seems to indicate that an old independent Dhp-commentarial tradition has been modernized under the influence of the Ja-commentary, when the “new” Dhp-a was created. The old Dhp-commentary contained most probably only short Vatthus such as Dhp-a XVI,3 Visākhāvatthu (Dhp-a III 278,14–279,28), which in this particular case cannot be traced back to any older source.

In contrast to Ja stories found in the commentaries on the first four Nikāyas (§ 261) there is no trace of older stories explicitly connected to Dhp verses. Therefore, it seems that no *ākhyānas* were ever connected to Dhp-verses (cf. § 113).

269. The Vatthus were rebuilt under the influence of the Ja into partly very long and complex stories such as Dhp-a II,1 Udena-vatthu (Dhp-a I 161–231). This influence can be felt also in those stories, which do not occur in the Ja-commentary, but have been shaped as if they were Jātakas by adding the typical beginning *atīte* ..., Dhp-a I 169,9. Some of these “Ja-stories” contain verses, but no commentary on them. Therefore, they may be called apocryphal Jātakas incorporated into the Dhp-a (§ 270).

<sup>466</sup> Adikaram 1946: 30 sq.



Often only the introductory stories (*paccuppannavatthu*) were adopted by Dhp-a, because it was felt necessary only to connect the Dhp-verses to the presence at the time of the Buddha, but not to his past lives.

Thus the “new” Dhp-a is brought close to the Ja. This means that it was composed later than, hardly at the same time as the Ja-commentary, because there is no trace of a reference to or transfer of stories from Dhp-a to the Ja-commentary. The time of the composition of Dhp-a is unknown<sup>467</sup>. It seems, however, to have been written in Ceylon (§ 265).

The Dhp-a has been translated at an early date into Sinhalese under the title *Saddharmaratnāvaliya*<sup>468</sup> and into Burmese<sup>469</sup>.

#### V.2.3.4 Apocryphal Jātakas

270. At an early date there were versions of Jātakas considered as apocryphal such as the *Gūḷha-Vessantara* and the *Gūḷha-Ummaga* (Sp 742,30, cf. 232,8; Spk II 201,27; cf. § 437). A later collection of Jātakas considered as apocryphal was probably assembled at Chiang Mai in North Thailand. The literary form has been modelled after Ja and Dhp-a:

[**Paññāsajātaka (Paññāsa-ja: 2.5.10,2)**]: Edition: *Paññāsa-Jātaka* or *Zimme Paṇṇāsa* (in the Burmese Recension<sup>470</sup>) Edited by P.S.Jaini. London I (1981), II (1983) [rev.: ZDMG 133.1983: 225sq.; 135.1985: 434]; Translation: *Apocryphal Birth Stories*. London I Trsl. by I.B. Horner and P.S.Jaini (1985), II Trsl. by P.S.Jaini (1986)<sup>471</sup>.

The “Fifty Ja” are arranged in five Vaggas of ten Ja each. The number of verses, which do not have a commentary, has not been taken into account in this arrangement.

<sup>467</sup> Burlingame’s guess “450 AD”, Dhp-a-trsl 57 [§ 8] is not unlikely, but cannot be substantiated.

<sup>468</sup> For selected translations: Obeyesekere 1992.

<sup>469</sup> For selected translations: Rogers 1870.

<sup>470</sup> There are widely different Siamese and Kambodian (partly edited with a Khmer trsl. Phnom Penh 1953) versions: *Paññāsa-ja* I, p. V, cf. Supaphan 1990: 14–80; on the Thai version cf. Lausunthorn 1995. – On an appendix to *Paññāsa-ja*: § 429.

<sup>471</sup> No. 6 *Samuddaghosa-ja* has been studied and edited in Terral 1956; different versions of no. 11 *Sudhanakumāra-ja* (up to *Paññāsa-ja* I 143,20) and no. 17 *Siricūḍāmaṇ-irāja-ja* (*Paññāsa-ja* I 199,12–205,32) have been edited by Tanabe 1981, 1983, and 1991; no. 36 *Velāma-ja* has been translated and analysed by Terral-Martini 1959; cf. § 109, 321.

The story of the past is mostly set in Benares as in the Ja, but occasionally Burmese place names seem to occur such as no. 12 Hamsa-vatī (Pegu?) or no. 26 Sudhammavatī (Thaton).

Sources of the stories are the old Ja and Dh-p-a besides Buddhist Skt. literature such as the Divyāvadāna, once even the Pañcatantra; verses are quoted from the Mahābhārata and Manu<sup>472</sup>.

**271.** The story no. 37 Vaṭṭaṅgulirāja-ja tells how the first Buddha image was made by Bimbisāra the king of Kosala<sup>473</sup>. This popular subject is treated again in an independent version composed in Ceylon perhaps during the 13th/14th centuries:

**[Kosalabimbavapṇanā (Kbv: 4.2.13)]:** Edition: R.Gombrich in: Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries. Göttingen 1978 AAWG Nr. 108, 281–303.

The form of this text “devoid of literary merit” (Gombrich) is loosely connected to that of a Ja; it is unknown outside Ceylon.

#### V.2.3.5 Dhammapāla’s Commentaries: The Paramatthadīpanī

**272.** The second important commentator after Buddhaghosa is Dhammapāla, who is supposed to have written a large number of commentaries (§ 356):

- I. Paramatthadīpanī I–VII on: Ud, It, Vv, Pv, Th, Thī, Cp
- II. Subcommentaries to: Sv, Ps, Spk, Mp (§ 357), Ja, Bv, As, Vibh-a, Ppk-a (§ 360)
- II. Commentary on Vism (§ 361)
- III. Commentary on Nett (§ 362)

It is normally assumed, though without justification, that there were two different Dhammapālas at work (§ 360, 364).

All attempts to connect Dhammapāla to other Buddhists of the same name have been unsuccessful<sup>474</sup>. It is also impossible to find

<sup>472</sup> Paññāsa-ja II, p. XVII.

<sup>473</sup> Paññāsa-ja II, p. XXXII sq.; on texts concerning Siamese Buddha images: § 427.

<sup>474</sup> The connection to the Yogācāra Dharmapāla mentioned by Xuanzang/ Hsüan-tsang is wishful thinking as shown already by Hardy 1897. On this Dharmapāla cf. Tillemans 1990: 8 and Mayer 1992: 25–28.

out whether Dhammapāla was South Indian, which seems likely, or Ceylonese<sup>475</sup>.

**273.** Dhammapāla in his Paramatthadīpanī (§ 85, 251) did not adopt the sequence of texts as usual in the Khuddakanikāya, and he used recensions of Ap (§ 123) and Cp (§ 128) different from those of the Mahāvihāra.

**Udāna-aṭṭhakathā (Ud-a: 2.5.3,1):** Edition: F.L.Woodward 1926; translation: The Udāna Commentary ... Translated by P.Masefield. Oxford I (1994), II (1995).

**Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā (It-a: 2.5.4,1):** Edition: M.M.Bose I (1934), II (1936), III [with Index by H.Kopp. London] (1980); translation: P.Masefield (under preparation).

**Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā (Vv-a: 2.5.6,1):** Edition: E.Hardy 1901; translation: Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning so Named the Commentary of the Vimāna-Stories Translated by P.Masefield. Oxford 1989.

**Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā (Pv-a: 2.5.7,1):** Edition: E.Hardy (1894<sup>476</sup>); translation: Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning so Named the Commentary on the Peta-Stories Translated by P.Masefield. London 1980.

**Theragāthā-aṭṭhakathā (Th-a: 2.5.8,1):** Edition: F.L.Woodward I (1940), II (1952), III [with Indexes by H.Kopp] (1959).

**Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā (Thī-a: 2.5.9,1):** Edition: E.Müller (1893); translation: W.Pruitt (under preparation together with a revised edition of Thī-a).

**Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā (Cp-a: 2.5.15,1):** Edition: R.L.Barua (1939), Second Edition with Indexes by H.Kopp. London 1979.

Subcommentaries to the Paramatthadīpanī are only known from the Piṭ-sam (§ 4).

**274.** These commentaries, obviously modelled on those by Buddhaghosa, were conceived by Dhammapāla as one set. This is underlined by the introductory and concluding verses to the Paramatthadīpanī, which are identical except where they refer to the individual texts.

Dhammapāla, too, emphasizes the Mahāvihāra orthodoxy and that his commentaries are based on the four Nikāyas (Ud-a 2,6\*; It-a

<sup>475</sup> The history of research has been summed up by Pieris 1978.

<sup>476</sup> Rather 1896, cf. introduction to Pv-a VIII, note 1.

I 2,4\* etc.), with the exception of Cp-a being based on the Jātaka (Cp-a 1,27\*). The Nikāyas are not mentioned in Vv-a and Pv-a because these texts are not in the same way connected to them as Ud etc. are.

Nothing is said about older sources (§ 286). When Dhammapāla refers to *āgamaṭṭhakathāsu*, Vv-a 3,11sq. he may have had Buddhaghosa in mind (cf. § 317).

The title Paramatthadīpanī is mentioned in the *nigamana*, which also gives the length of the respective commentaries in *bhāṇavāras*. Perhaps it was modelled after Paramatthajotikā, if not vice versa.

The brief colophon contains the name of the author and his monastery, the Badaratiṭṭha-vihāra<sup>477</sup>, as unidentified as Moraṇḍakheṭaka (§ 227)<sup>478</sup>.

**275.** Dhammapāla's commentaries are grouped together in the following manner: Ud-a and It-a, Vv-a and Pv-a form two units. Th-a and Thī-a really are only one commentary having common introductory and concluding verses<sup>479</sup>. Finally Cp-a stands apart<sup>480</sup>.

**276.** Following the example of Buddhaghosa, the individual parts of Paramatthadīpanī begin with surveys of the respective texts they are going to explain. Thī-a refers back to the common table of contents given at the beginning of Th-a<sup>481</sup>.

Besides Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla was also familiar with Dhpa-a and Ja, which are quoted e.g. at Vv-a 165,17 sq.<sup>482</sup>; Th-a II 148,5 and Ud-a 124,20 respectively.

**277.** Only Ud-a and It-a comment on texts containing Suttantas. Consequently, Dhammapāla could follow Buddhaghosa particularly closely here: the way of quoting the basic text: *Mucalindassa paṭhame*, Ud-a 100,3 or *dutiyavaggassa paṭhame*, It-a I 117,6 corresponds to Spk or Mp (§ 238).

<sup>477</sup> With variants, the oldest being Baddhara- in the 16th century Northern Thai manuscripts. It is impossible to decide which is the true form of the place name; cf. § 361.

<sup>478</sup> Cf. Pieris 1978: 66.

<sup>479</sup> There are no introductory verses at the beginning of Thī-a. The concluding verses printed at the end of Th-a in E° are correctly omitted in oriental editions.

<sup>480</sup> Thus there are only six parts of the Paramatthadīpanī, which has been split conveniently into seven parts for practical purposes.

<sup>481</sup> Thī-a 4,26 refers to Th-a I 3,33–4,14.

<sup>482</sup> On this quotation see however § 280.

Moreover, Ud-a 5,17–22 and It-a I 3,1–5 refer to Sv for the history of the text tradition (§ 228), and rely on Sv etc. for the explanation of terms such as *tathāgata* (§ 288) or *evaṃ me sutaṃ* (§ 230 note 407). The unique introductory formula of It is explained by the fact that this text was heard and handed down at the very beginning by the laywoman Khujjuttarā (§ 79, 93)<sup>483</sup>.

**278.** The definition of the *suttanikkhepas*, Ud-a 29,26–30,19; It-a I 34,7–37,12 is based on Sv (§ 230), but differs from the one in Pj I (§ 254) and Pj II (§ 256). At the same time it is much more technical than in Sv, thus showing an advanced stage of the corresponding discussion, which had developed certain connections among single *suttanikkhepas* not yet found in the earlier commentaries.

**279.** Occasionally parts of the Paramatthadīpanī are connected by cross references<sup>484</sup>. Moreover, in Ud-a 326,35; 373,23 Nett has also been quoted and at Ud-a 33,11; 43,24 reference has been made to Vibh-a. Connections to Sp are found in the commentary on the Mucaḷinda episode (Ud-a 100,3–102,12, cf. Sp 958,22–959,18). These and further parallels to other commentaries in both Ud-a and It-a still need investigation.

**280.** The similarity of Vv and Pv is mirrored in their commentaries. Both Vv-a and Pv-a form a unit, which is stressed by cross references<sup>485</sup>, and both comment on verses. Consequently their form is nearer to that of Dhp-a and Ja than to Ud-a or It-a. Dhammapāla even refers explicitly to Dhp-a for a more detailed version of the story connected to the Mallikā-vimāna, Vv III, 8 (Vv-a 165,5–169,27) at Vv-a 165,17sq.<sup>486</sup>. However, Dhp-a XI, 6 Mallikādevīvattu (Dhp-a III 119,8–123,6) is quite different<sup>487</sup>. The relationship between Dham-

<sup>483</sup> It-a I 29,6–33,8 cf. Mp I 418,21–445,26, where this particular feature is not yet mentioned.

<sup>484</sup> Ud-a 46,18 or Th-a I 36,18sq.

<sup>485</sup> Pv-a 71,31; 92,18 etc. with a strange reference *paramatthavibhāvanīyaṃ vimānavatthuvannandyaṃ*, Pv-a 244,9 (cf. § 300). This wording is confirmed by a manuscript from Vat Lai Hin copied AD 1514. – A further manuscript from that monastery copied in the middle of the 16th century has Paramatthajotikā (!) in the colophon to Pv-a, but Paramatthadīpanī in the *nigamana*.

<sup>486</sup> This story is also found at Sv 597,8–23.

<sup>487</sup> Cf. Dhp-a-trsl II p. 340, note 1. On parallels between Vv-a, Pv-a and Dhp-a: Dhp-a-trsl I p. 56 sq. § 7 sq.

mapāla's commentaries and Dhp-a is rather complicated, and it cannot be ruled out that he used a version slightly different from our text, as he does in the case of Ap (§ 123). As there is no reference in Dhp-a either to Vv-a or to Pv-a, it seems likely that Dhp-a is the older text, but not necessarily the model for Dhammapāla's commentaries on Vv and Pv. Perhaps both used the same source material.

The same conclusion is likely when comparing Pv I, 5 Tirokuḍḍa-petavattu (Pv-a 19,21–31,11) and Pj I on Khp VII Tirokuḍḍa (§ 254).

The relation to Ja can be studied by comparing Vv III 5 Guttīlavimāna (Vv-a 137,13–148,30) to Ja no. 243 Guttīla-ja (Ja II 248,5–257,12), which expressly quotes the Guttīla-vimāna (Ja II 25,10). It seems as if Dhammapāla developed the text as found in the Ja<sup>488</sup>.

**281.** Vv-a and Pv-a begin with a brief discussion of the way in which the commentator wants to proceed<sup>489</sup> and about the manner in which the texts of Vv and Pv have been collected according to the tradition. The verses are thought to have been brought down to earth by Mogallāna and Nārada respectively. The collection as such was assembled at the first council, and some verses are actually thought to have been added by the monks participating in that council<sup>490</sup>.

**282.** The forms of Vv-a and Pv-a are slightly different, if the introduction to the individual stories are compared, and are much less uniform in Pv-a than in Vv-a. The beginning of Pv II, 10 Uttaramātu-petavattu is unique: “after the *nibbāna* of the Teacher ...” (Pv-a 140,21 sq.). The commentary states that this Vattu was added only during the second council (Pv-a 144,20 sq.<sup>491</sup>).

**283.** A third type of commentary is represented by **Th-a** and **Thī-a**. Next to the explanation of the verses the respective authors, Theras and Therīs, who are supposed to have spoken these verses, are introduced. For this purpose their Apadānas are used, but in a recension different from the one found in the Mahāvihāra-Tiṭṭaka (§ 123). The relation to the Ap is discussed by Dhammapāla himself in a Pakiṇṇa-

<sup>488</sup> Hardy 1899: 28; Alsdorf 1971: 53 sq.; Lawergen 1994; on parallels outside Theravāda literature: Bechert 1974.

<sup>489</sup> Redundancy is avoided by not repeating *nidānas* common to two Vimānas.

<sup>490</sup> Cf. e.g. Vv-a 332,30; Pv-a 137,24.

<sup>491</sup> For a similar case cf. Vv-a 352,9–16.

ka (Th-a III 203,3–209,35), where also groups of Theras and the 80 *mahāsāvakas* are mentioned (Th-a III 205,27–206,6).

Besides Ap, texts such as the hagiographical sections in Mp (cf. § 235) have been used. Dhp-a is explicitly referred to (Th-a II 255,9 sq.) for a detailed version of a story (Dhp-a II 240,5–252,8).

**284.** At the beginning of Thī-a, the previous lives and the last life of the Buddha up to the ordination of Mahāpajāpati Gotami as the first nun are briefly related (Thī-a 1,9–4,27). In the corresponding paragraph of Th Dhammapāla refers to Cp-a (Th-a I 10,7) for these events.

**285.** Cp-a is near to the Ja, and the latter is referred to (Cp-a 3,12). This commentary ends in an important discussion on the ten *pāramīs* contained in a long Pakiṇṇaka (Cp-a 276,26–332,30).

**286.** Numerous indications show that Dhammapāla makes extensive use of the works by his predecessor Buddhaghosa: *sambahula*, Ud-a 102,15–17 is explained as in Sv (§ 232 note 412) differing from Pj II (§ 257 note 452) as does the definition of *uposatha*, Ud-a 296,2–10, cf. Sv 139,14 sq., but Pj II 199,16 sq. Explaining *isisattama*, Th-a III 195,25 sq.; Vv-a 105,25 sq. Dhammapāla even supplements Buddhaghosa<sup>492</sup>, and occasionally he seems to follow a tradition different from that of his predecessor, e.g., when he refers to Bhaggava, a person not mentioned by Buddhaghosa, as the first teacher of the Bodhisatta (Thī-a 2,9).

Thus Dhammapāla is certainly later than Buddhaghosa (§ 364–366), but also later than Dhp-a and Ja, which he uses as well (§ 307). He is even supposed to have written a subcommentary to Ja (§ 359).

Pj I and Pj II are not close to Dhammapāla: Pj II uses a third recension of Ap, and Pj I and Pv-a go back to the same source once, but are not immediately connected to each other (§ 280). Thus the chronological relation between Pj I and Pj II on one side, and Dhammapāla on the other, remains open.

If, however, Dhammapāla is later than all these commentaries, he supplemented those texts from the Khuddakanikāya, which did not yet have a “new” Aṭṭhakathā at his time, perhaps because they were only gradually integrated into the fifth Nikāya. Then it might be pos-

<sup>492</sup> Cf. Gombrich 1986–1992: 330.

sible that Ap, which Dhammapāla knew in a different recension, had not yet reached full canonical recognition, nor did perhaps Bv, which was also known to Dhammapāla<sup>493</sup>.

In how far Dhammapāla had older commentaries before him, when writing Paramatthadīpanī is not clear (§ 274). The different shape of the otherwise close Vv-a and Pv-a would be easily explicable if reflecting the structure of earlier versions.

### V.2.3.6 The Saddhammapajjotikā

**Saddhammapajjotikā (Nidd-a: 2.5.11,1):** Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta I (1931), II (1939), III (1940)<sup>494</sup>.

**287.** The introductory verses name Sāriputta as author of Nidd (Nidd-a I 1,14\*, cf. § 116), which comments on parts of Sn. Thus Nidd-a really is a subcommentary (cf. § 296), which was written at the request of a certain Thera Deva (Nidd-a I 1,22\*). The title Saddhammapajjotikā (Nidd-a I 2,15\*) covers the commentary on both Niddesas, which form one unit (§ 116); it may have been coined after Paramatthajjotikā (§ 252).

The *nigamana* (Nidd-a III 150,2\*-152,27\*) was built on the model of the one in Paṭi-a (§ 291) and likewise contains a lot of information. The author mentions his name: Upasena (Nidd-a III 151,25\*), and that he worked in the Mahāvihāra.

Nidd-a was completed in the 26th year of the king Sirinivāsa Sirisaṅghabodhi, Nidd-a III 152,1\*sq., which is a frequent epithet of Sinhalese kings. However, only Sena II. Sirisaṅghabodhi<sup>495</sup> (851–885/791–825) reigned long enough. Moreover, the minister Kittisena, who donated a *parivena* to Upasena (Nidd-a III 151,18\*-21\*), seems to be identical with the *mahālekha* “head scribe” Sena (Mhv LII 33) active under Sena II. Thus the date of Nidd-a is most probably AD 877 or 817<sup>496</sup>, and consequently about 300 years later than Paṭi-a (§ 296).

<sup>493</sup> Cf. *Jātaka-Buddhavaṃsādisu*, Cp-a 331,2.

<sup>494</sup> For practical reason Nidd-a I, II, III is referred to by volume deviating from the CPD usage.

<sup>495</sup> The epithet is mentioned for this king by Geiger 1960/1986: 225 (list of kings, no. 54), but cf. Nidd-a II p. VI.

<sup>496</sup> A.P.Buddhadatta, Nidd-a I p. IX prefers Aggabodhi I. (568–601/508–541), who, however, is not called Sirisaṅghabodhi, but only donated a monastery of that name. Moreover, nothing is known about a minister Kittisena during his reign.



**288.** The commentary proper begins with a definition of *niddesa*, Nidd-a I 2,17–9,5 using material from Nett (Nett 38,24–27 ≠ Nidd-a I 2,19–21) followed by a praise of the Mahāniddesa (Nidd-a I 9,6–27) before the position of this text within the Tipiṭaka is described (Nidd-a I 9,28–10,17). Here Upasena borrows material from Dhammapāla (Ud-a 4,10sq.) as he does, e.g., in the explanation of *tathāgata*, Nidd-a I 177,33–184,10, cf. Ud-a 128,4–155,28, which can be traced back to Sv 59,30–68,13 (cf. § 277).

**289.** Not only Nidd is commented on, but also Sn by mechanically copying Pj II on Sn 766 sq.: Even a cross reference meaningless in Nidd-a (Nidd-a II 315,3–6) as referring to Pj II 359,25–361,27 was taken over. Consequently, Nidd-a borrows the complete explanation on the individual words found in Sn from Pj II.

**290.** Upasena heavily relies on predecessors, though it is impossible to ascertain at present whether there was an older commentary on Nidd. Vism and Mil were used, and once a verse from the old Aṭṭhakathā is quoted (Nidd-a II 300,23\*sq.), perhaps from Vism 234,1\*sq., where, however, this verse is not attributed to any source.

Although he knows Dhammapāla's commentaries (§ 288), Upasena does not seem to develop the latter's ideas in a similar way as Dhammapāla does in respect to Buddhaghosa (§ 278). It seems doubtful whether Upasena contributes much, if anything of his own beyond compiling material. Therefore, his work might mark the turning point from creative to compilatory commentaries.

### V.2.3.7 The Saddhammapakāsinī

**Saddhammapakāsinī** (Paṭis-a: 2.5,12,1): Edition: C. V. Joshi I (1933), II (1940), III (1947).

Gaṇṭhipada: **Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathāgaṇṭhipada** ([Paṭis-gp]: 2.5,12,13): B<sup>c</sup> 1984.

**291.** The introductory verses name Sāriputta as the author of Paṭis (Paṭis-a I 1,18\*, cf. § 119) and mention the title Saddhammapakāsinī (Paṭis-a I 2,19\*). Compared to earlier commentaries, the *nigamana*, which is the model of the one in Nidd-a (§ 287), contains an exceptional amount of information. For the first time the name of the author is mentioned: Mahānāma (Paṭis-a 704,1\*), who lived in the Mahāvihāra in a *pariveṇa* donated by a minister (Paṭis-a 703, 28\*).

The date of the text is expressed in an unusual way: “when king Moggallāna was dead for three years” (Paṭis-a 704,2\*). This might point to a time when the succession of kings was doubtful, which was the case exactly three years after the death of Moggallāna II. (537–556/477–496)<sup>497</sup>. Thus Paṭis-a appears to have been completed in AD 559 or 499.

**292.** The commentary begins by defining *paṭisambhidā*, Paṭis-a 3,22–8,16 using text from Vism 440,30–443,8 enlarged by Vibh-a 387,5–388,16 = Paṭis-a 5,4–6,20 on languages (*nirutti*): Due to the character of Paṭis there are frequent connections to Vism and the Abhidhamma commentaries. The description of the position of Paṭis within the Tipitaka (Paṭis-a 9,11–25) echoes Ud-a 4,10–20; Paṭis-a 8,16–10,6 is later adapted by Nidd-a I 9,10–10,2.

**293.** Mahānāma follows the principle of *apubbavaṇṇanā* (§ 214, 256), which results in an uneven proportion of commentary to text. Individual words are occasionally explained by “lexicon verses” (§ 231; 320; 450). One of these verses is attributed to the old Aṭṭhakathā (*abhisamaya*, Paṭis-a 331,31\*–34\*). Therefore, this method of explanation could be much older than the new Aṭṭhakathā, which appears to quite readily abandon it. Consequently, it is not impossible that these verses date back to about AD 200, if not earlier (§ 206).

**294.** The basic text is quoted as *pariññeyyaniddese* ..., Paṭis-a 109,2, although these divisions are alien to Paṭis. It is remarkable that this is given up in the Nāpaniddesa (Paṭis-a 435,2), where a system similar to but not identical with that of Pj I has been used (cf. § 254).

**295.** It seems that there was no older commentary on Paṭis<sup>498</sup>. As Vism contains and explains many quotations from Paṭis, Paṭis-a frequently takes the relevant material from Vism, without, however, following Vism mechanically, cf. Vism 268,30–291,3 ≠ Paṭis-a 488,8–504,28 on *ānāpāṇasatī*. Other sources are treated in the same independent way: When the *dvattiṃsākāra*, Paṭis I 6,31–7,7 are explained (Paṭis-a 80,25–83,15), Mahānāma neither follows Vism nor Pj I exactly (§ 254, 318).

<sup>497</sup> Cf. Geiger 1960/1986: 225 (list of kings, nos. 26 and 27).

<sup>498</sup> Cf. Paṭis-trsl p. XLII sq.

He also made use of the old Aṭṭhakathā, which he quotes e.g. on *kāmadhātu*, Paṭis-a 68,14–18 and compares to what is said on this term in the Dasuttara- and Saṅgīti-suttantas, DN nos 33 and 34, respectively.

In explaining the concept of emptiness (*suñña*), Mahānāma refers to a *ñāyagantha* “book on logic” and a *saddagantha* “grammar” (Paṭis-a III 632,20 qu. Nidd-a III 74,1–15), which are not easily identified<sup>499</sup>.

**296.** It is difficult at present to judge Mahānāma’s relation to other commentaries. Any obvious reference to Dhammapāla is absent: Probably Mahānāma antedates him. However, Paṭis-a has much in common with Nidd-a, which is about 300 years younger (§ 287), and certainly knows Dhammapāla (§ 288). The close connection to Nidd-a on the other hand may be due to the fact that both could be called “subcommentaries” (cf. § 287): Paṭis often quotes from and comments on canonical texts, thus being a “subcommentary”<sup>500</sup>.

**297.** The age of Paṭis-gp is uncertain<sup>501</sup>. The first verse of the introduction was quoted by Aggavaṃsa in AD 1154 (Sadd 753,34\*) thus giving a date *ante quem*. According to the introduction to B<sup>e</sup>, Paṭis-gp is different from the Līnatthadīpanīṭikā mentioned by Vācissara in his *nigamana* to Thūp 255,1\* (§ 192)<sup>502</sup>.

### V.2.3.8 The Madhuratthavilāsini

**Madhuratthavilāsini** (Bv-a: 2.5.14,1): Edition: I.B.Horner (1946); translation: The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhuratthavilāsini). Commentary on the Chronicle of the Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) of Buddhadatta Thera trsl. by I.B.Horner. London 1978.

**298.** The introductory verses name a certain Saddhammaratana Buddhasīha (Bv-a 1,26\*) as the initiator of the Buddhavaṃsasamvaṇṇanā (Bv-a 2,7\*).

More information is found in the *nigamana*, which, however, is missing by chance(?) in the oldest manuscript<sup>503</sup>. Strangely, the title

<sup>499</sup> Cf. the attempts in Pind 1992b: 19–27.

<sup>500</sup> Cf. Sp on the Vibhaṅga commentary (§ 22).

<sup>501</sup> According to Paṭis-trsl p. XLIII 9th/10th, which cannot be substantiated.

<sup>502</sup> B<sup>e</sup> p. *kha* sq., but cf. CPD (Epil.) 2.5.12,13.

<sup>503</sup> Copied in AD 1551 and preserved at Vat Lai Hin.

given here is Madhuratthappakāsini, Bv-a 299,14\*<sup>504</sup>. It is said that the author lived in a monastery built by a certain Kaṇhadāsa in Kāveripaṭṭana near the Godhāvārī (Bv-a 299,16\*-19\*), which is difficult to reconcile with South Indian topography and may refer to Ceylon<sup>505</sup>. The author Buddhadatta and the title Madhuratthavilāsini occur only in the colophon, where the length of the text is given as 26 *bhānavāras* = 203000 *akkharas*, erroneously so, as it is 208000.

All this taken together raises the suspicion that the colophon could be secondary and added, because Buddhadatta mentions an initiator Buddhasiṃha, Vin-vn 3177, and lived in a monastery built by Veṇhudāsa, Vin-vn 3171 (§ 328). If so, the title of the anonymous commentary is more likely to be Madhuratthappakāsini.

**299.** The commentary begins with a kind of guide to the lives of the Buddhas (Bv-a 2,26–3,2), which is based on Sv 410,21–421,28 (cf. § 235). The method of explanation is described (Bv-a 4,27\*sq.) and the *suttanikkhepas* are mentioned (Bv-a 64,10–29) following Buddhaghosa (§ 230) without referring to Dhammapāla's more evolved definition (§ 278). The whole Bv is defined as *pucchāvasika*, Bv-a 65,4, because Sāriputta asks the Buddha a question (Bv I 74sq.).

Bv-a ends in a long appendix (Bv-a 296,1–299,8) on differences between the individual Buddhas.

**300.** Bv-a appears to refer to Buddhaghosa occasionally, and to the old Aṭṭhakathā (Bv-a 131,32\*-132,2\*, cf. Cp-a 15,3–13\*).

Only two texts are actually quoted<sup>506</sup>: *Atthasāliniyā*, Bv-a 126,29 refers to As (B<sup>e</sup>) 55,15\*-18\* and *Vimalatthavilāsiniyā* (!) *Vimānavatthaṭṭhakathā*, Bv-a 284, 27 (cf. § 280 note 485), which may refer to Vv-a 311,28–318,3 or a predecessor (?). Moreover, Bv-a 4,29–32 appears to presuppose the Ja-Nidāna (§ 111).

**301.** Without a careful investigation into the relation of Bv-a to other commentaries it is impossible to tell, whether or not the probably anonymous Bv-a knows Dhammapāla in addition to the younger Ja (§ 286). The provisional dating into the 8th century in Cousins 1972: 163 is not unlikely, even though this cannot be substantiated.

<sup>504</sup> The Lai Hin manuscript (s. preceding note) has Madhurasavilāsini in the colophon at the very end; otherwise the manuscript has -attha-.

<sup>505</sup> Cf. the canals named Kāverī and Godāvārī, Mhv LXXIX 55–57.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. Bv-a-trsl p. XXXII.

## V.2.3.9 The Visuddhajanavilāsini

**Visuddhajanavilāsini** (Ap-a: 2.5.13,1): Edition: Visuddhajanavilāsini nāma Apadānaṭṭhakathā ed. by C.E.Godakumbura. London 1954.

**302.** Place and date of Ap-a are uncertain<sup>507</sup>. It is certainly late: no other commentary quotes Ap-a. Perhaps it was composed in Southeast Asia<sup>508</sup>. A colophon called *nigamana* in B<sup>c</sup> states that Ap-a was brought to Ceylon (?) by Guṇasobhana (Ap-a 571,13–17)<sup>509</sup>.

**303.** In contrast to earlier commentaries, Ap-a, which begins with a long quotation from the Ja-Nidāna (§ 111) (Ap-a 2,21–99,8 = Ja I 2,13–94,27)<sup>510</sup>, does not wish to follow the “contradictory and inadequate” old Aṭṭhakathā (Ap-a 2,1\*–4\*).

After commenting at length on the Buddha-ap (Ap-a 102,27–127,30), the Paccekabuddha-ap (Ap-a 128,2–206,22), which includes a list of names of Paccekabuddhas (Ap-a 129,15–24), the long explanation of Apadānas 1–180 (Ap-a 206,26–464,35) begins, while only very brief treatment is given to Apadānas 181–561 (Ap-a 465,2–571,7). There is no commentary on the Therī-ap, which is mentioned Ap-a 101,6.

**304.** Ap-a refers to the Sanskrit grammars of Pāṇini, Candra and to the Kātantra<sup>511</sup>. In this connection it is worth mentioning that Ap-a uses the phrase *gaṅgāvalīkopama*, Ap-a 102,2 which is extremely common in Buddhist Sanskrit texts, but not found elsewhere in Pāli literature it seems.

## V.2.3.10 Survey of the Khuddakanikāya-Commentaries

**305.** Although the absolute and even the relative chronology of the commentaries on the Khuddakanikāya remains largely doubtful, a few preliminary statements can be made. The commentaries certainly presuppose Vism together with the commentaries on the first four Nikā-

<sup>507</sup> The earliest certain date for Ap-a is that of the oldest manuscript copied AD 1537 and preserved at Vat Lai Hin.

<sup>508</sup> In Burma according to Bechert 1958: 20.

<sup>509</sup> It is not clear whether Ap-a was lost and reintroduced, or whether this refers to the original introduction of this text from Southeast Asia.

<sup>510</sup> The introduction to Ap-a is adopted to Ja in S<sup>c</sup>, cf. § 261 note 456.

<sup>511</sup> Ap-a p. XVII.

yas, and no Khuddakanikāya-commentary can be attributed to Buddhaghosa<sup>512</sup>.

For Paṭis-a the earliest likely date is AD 559 or 499, which does not prove helpful, because this commentary can be related only to Nidd-a dated probably AD 877 or 817. Thus, the crucial question of Dhammapāla's date cannot be settled by the help of Paṭis-a.

**306.** Further, it can be assumed that Dhammapāla presupposes Ja and Dhp-a in this sequence (§ 286). Ap-a is the latest of all Khuddakanikāya-commentaries. All further considerations would become more and more conjectural. At present the only way to approach the problem of dating the commentaries appears to be making very general deliberations on the cultural and political history of Ceylon which created an environment favourable for cultural activities.

Buddhaghosa worked during a restauration of the Mahāvihāra, probably during the fairly long reign of Mahānāma (409–431/349–371). A similar occasion for writing commentaries on the Khuddakanikāya, particularly the large portion by Dhammapāla, is not obvious. If it is not by chance that Paṭis-a does not refer to Dhammapāla (§ 296), he must have worked later than 560, perhaps during the restauration of the kingship under Aggabodhi I. (568–601/508–541). However, a later date, though before AD 877 or 817 (Nidd-a), cannot be ruled out, nor necessarily even a slightly earlier period such as e.g. that of Moggallāna II. (537–556/477–496). This, however, should be the minimum interval between Buddhaghosa (5th century) and Dhammapāla, because the commentaries of Buddhaghosa do not yet use the “classical” Theravāda form of the Ja (§ 113), As appears to antedate the Ja-Nidānakathā (§ 316), and there are commentaries composed later than Ja, but earlier than Dhammapāla's works. The intervals between these individual commentaries – Ja – Dhp-a – perhaps Pj I/II – cannot be guessed: they could be years or decades, but hardly centuries.

**307.** The relative chronology can be shown very tentatively as follows (cf. § 370):

<sup>512</sup> Warder, Paṭis-trsl p. XLII sq., attractively conjectures that Buddhaghosa composed commentaries only where there was an old Aṭṭhakathā. However, both Ja and Dhp-a also appear to have had predecessors (§ 268sq.).

Before AD 450: Sp (AD 429/430 or 369/370 ?, cf. § 209); Buddhaghosa: Vism with Sv, Ps, Spk, Mp and the anonymous Abhidhamma commentaries

After 450:

Ja

Dhp-a

[Pj I/II ]

AD 559: Mahānāma: Paṭis-a

after AD 550: Dhammapāla

AD 877: Upasena: Nidd-a

between AD 1000 and AD 1500: Ap-a.

Only Bv-a remains outside the relative chronology so far. A thorough investigation into the relation to other commentaries could bring this problem nearer to a solution.

### V.3 The Commentaries on the Abhidhammapiṭaka

**308.** The commentaries on the Abhidhammapiṭaka were conceived as a unit divided into three parts: As on Dhs, Vibh-a on Vibh and the Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā on Dhātuk, Pp, Kv, Yam and Paṭṭh. There is a large number of subcommentaries on the Abhidhammapiṭaka<sup>513</sup>.

**Atthasālinī (As: 3.1,1):** Editions: E.Müller 1879, reprinted with an index and variant readings by L.Cousins and a table of quotations by I.B.Horner. London 1979; N<sup>e</sup>: P.V.Bapat and R.D.Vadekar. Poona 1942<sup>514</sup>; translation: The Expositor (Atthasālinī) ... trsl. by Pe Maung Tin, ed. and rev. by C.A.F. Rhys Davids<sup>515</sup>.

**Sammohavinodanī (Vibh-a: 3.2,1):** Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta 1923; translation: The Dispeller of Delusion (Sammohavinodanī) trsl. from the Pāli by Nāṇamoli, rev. for publication by L.Cousins, Nyanaponika, and C.M.M.Shaw. London I (1987), II (1991).

<sup>513</sup> These will not be dealt with in detail, but cf. § 356, 360, 380. — On 3.1,13 *Maṇidīpa* and 3.1,14 *Madhusārattadīpanī* (or: *Madhuṭṭikā*) cf. Bollée 1968: 313sq.: The latter was written by Ānanda, not Mahānāma as stated in the CPD (Epil.).

<sup>514</sup> This edition is superior to E<sup>c</sup> and contains an important introduction.

<sup>515</sup> This translation must be used with utmost caution.

Subcommentary: **Gūḷhatthadīpanī** ([Vibh-ṭ: 3.2,13]): Fragment on Vibh-a 186,27–523,20 extant as manuscript copied during the 16th century, Vat Lai Hin<sup>516</sup>.

**Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā (Ppk-a): (Dhātuk-a: 3.3,1):** Edition: together with Dhātuk § 140; **(Pp-a: 3.4,1):** Edition: G.Landsberg and C.A.F.Rhys Davids JPTS 1914, repr. together with Pp § 141; **(Kv-a: 3.5,1):** Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-ṭṭhakathā ... ed. by N.A.Jayawickrama. London 1979; translation: The Debates Commentary trsl. by B.C.Law. London 1940; **(Yam-a: 3.6,1):** Edition: C.A.F.Rhys Davids, JPTS 1910–1912; **(Paṭṭh-a: 3.7,1):** Edition: together with Paṭṭhāna: § 154.

**309.** Only the first two commentaries bear individual names. The meaning of Atthasālinī is not clear<sup>517</sup>. Sammohavinodanī translates as “Dispeller of Dilusion” and Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā as “Commentary on the Five Treatises”<sup>518</sup>.

**310.** The unity of the Abhidhamma commentaries is underlined by the introductory verses to the individual parts and by the concluding verses at the end of Ppk-a.

The introduction to As states that the Abhidhamma texts have been preached by the Buddha in heaven (§ 133), and that they have been recited by Ānanda at Rājagaha (As 1,19\*–28\*), which contradicts the canonical account of the first council (§ 8). Moreover, it is emphasised that they can be used to refute heretical views (*nikāyantaraladdhi*, As 2,3\*)<sup>519</sup>.

**311.** The introductory verses to Vibh-a and all following parts begin: “after Dhs (etc.) has been explained ...”. At the very end it is said: “this is the commentary on the seven treatises, which has come to an end” (Ppk-a [B<sup>e</sup>] 598,2\*–4\*).

The length of the three parts of the commentary is approximately the same: As: 39, Vibh-a: 40 and Ppk-a: 41 *bhāṇavāras*.

<sup>516</sup> Cf. 3.9.3 *Abhidhammagūḷhatthadīpanī*.

<sup>517</sup> Explained as *attho sāro etissam ganthajāṭṭiyam* in the As-yojanā. /

<sup>518</sup> Occasionally the names *Paramatthadīpanī* “elucidation of the ultimate meaning” or *Paramatthattakathā* “commentary (explaining) the ultimate meaning” are mentioned without source: Kv-a, p. VII; Renou/Filliozat 1953 § 1991.

<sup>519</sup> Cf. As-index of proper names s.v. *vitandavādīn*; on this sect: Bechert 1955/1957: 341sq.



**312.** Topics discussed in Vism are not repeated (As 2,7\*–9\*), and it is not surprising that there are frequent references to Vism in the Abhidhamma commentaries. Thus, they are connected to Buddhaghosa, who is mentioned as their initiator (As 1,18\*, cf. Vibh-a 523,12\*), ruling out the possibility that he is the author in spite of the fact that these texts are ascribed to him also by adding the “Buddhaghosa colophon”. Moreover, as convincingly argued by Bapat and Vadekar<sup>520</sup>, the structure of the Abhidhamma commentary points to an author different from Buddhaghosa<sup>521</sup>. Occasionally technical terms were used, which seem to be alien to Vism etc.: *ḍīpanā* “explanation, commentary” (As index, Vibh-a 200,7) or *aṭṭhakathā-muttaka* (As index, Pp-a 174,26), cf. *pālimuttaka* (§ 218).

**313.** Nevertheless the Abhidhamma commentaries were included into the system of cross references connecting Vism with Sv, Ps, Spk and Mp<sup>522</sup>. This makes a lot of sense, if Buddhaghosa was the initiator, for that would guarantee that both sets of commentaries originated roughly at the same time.

**314.** According to Mhv, Buddhaghosa composed As together with the *Ñāṇodaya* (§ 448) even before he came to Ceylon. Saying this may be seen as an attempt to connect As to Buddhaghosa in the 12th century. Because of the introductory verses it was difficult, however, to ascribe this text directly to him. Consequently he could have written only some sort of first edition and requested someone else to write an updated version.

**315.** As the *Atthasālinī* is the first in this set of the commentaries, the Abhidhamma texts are described (As 6,13–10,30) and the table of contents of the Tipiṭaka is given (As 18,17–27,16), which corresponds exactly to Sp 18,1–29,15 (cf. § 212, 228). Moreover, the term *abhidhamma* (As 2,13–3,20, cf. § 129) is defined and the canonicity of Kv discussed (As 3,21–6,12, cf. § 144).

**316.** Much attention is paid to the missing *nidāna* of the Abhidhamma (cf. § 133)<sup>523</sup>. Two *nidānas* are mentioned (As 31,19sq.): the *adhigama-*

<sup>520</sup> As Ne<sup>e</sup> p. XXXIII–XXXIX.

<sup>521</sup> The same result was reached at by Jayawickrama, Kv-a p. IX–XIII, cf. also Cousins, Vibh-a-trsl.p. IX. Only Norman 1983: 123–125 supports the traditional view of Buddhaghosa as the author.

<sup>522</sup> Cf. As Ne<sup>e</sup> p. XXXIV and § 239.

<sup>523</sup> There are no *nidānas* in “Ja-Sn-Dhp”, As 29,31. This sequence of texts is that of the *Dīghabhāṇakas*: § 85.

*na-nidāna* covering the period from the Buddha Dīpaṃkara to the enlightenment and the *desanā-nidāna*, beginning with the *dharmacak-kapavattana*. Only the first is given in detail. It runs parallel to the Durenidāna (Ja 2,13–47,22)<sup>524</sup> without, however, being identical with it. A comparison shows that the Ja text is enlarged and evolved. At the beginning of the Avidūrenidāna As refers to the Acchariyabbhutadhammasuttanta, MN no. 123, MN 118,10–12,33 with the corresponding commentary (Ps IV 167,8–190,6) for a full version (As 33,109–22), and not to Ja. This is a further indication that As is earlier than the Ja-Nidānakathā (§ 111, 306, 321).

317. The commentary proper begins at As 36,17. Besides Buddhaghosa's commentaries, the old Aṭṭhakathā was used, which is called *mahaṭṭhakathā* in contrast to *āgamatṭhakathā*, As 86,24<sup>525</sup>. It is of particular importance for the relative chronology of texts that As 118,18–27 quotes a paragraph from the old Aṭṭhakathā, which in turn contains a quotation from the first part of Mil (Mil 38,22–26, cf. § 173)<sup>526</sup>. Consequently, Mil was known at the time when this particular part of the old Aṭṭhakathā was composed.

Sp is referred to only in a paragraph quoted from the Nikāya commentaries (As 97,29, cf. § 239).

As in the Vinaya commentary, As also discusses the different opinions, e.g., As 266,30–267,14 quoting *ayaṃ therassa manoratho*, As 267,1, where the new Aṭṭhakathā would have said *therassa attano mati* (§ 230), thus documenting a change in vocabulary (cf. § 249).

318. The *Sammohavinodanī* is closely connected to As by cross references (*vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathāyaṇ*, As 368,2; *dharmasaṅgahaṭṭhakathāyaṇ*, Vibh-a 43,14 etc.). Vibh-a also relies on the Nikāya commentaries by adopting long texts<sup>527</sup>, as usual with great care: When Vibh-a explains the *dvattiṃsākāra*, Vibh-a 224,16–249,5 by the help of Vism 241,26–265,29, which relies on Paṭi I 6,31–7,7 (cf. § 295), attention is drawn to the fact that the item *matthaluṅga* is missing in Vibh 193,18 (Vibh-a 225,7).

<sup>524</sup> The text is found only in As B<sup>e</sup> 33,10–75,12 and not in As E<sup>e</sup> 32,28sq.; on the relevant text in Ja: § 111.

<sup>525</sup> E<sup>e</sup> *āgamana-* is w.r., cf. Vv-a 3,11 (§ 274).

<sup>526</sup> Pind 1992a: 144.

<sup>527</sup> E.g. Sv 989,22–900,28 = Vibh-a 430,27–433,33 on *lokadhātu* and the disappearance of Buddhism, cf. § 85.

319. Sp is referred to Vibh-a 334,22 in a paragraph concerning Vinaya problems (Vibh-a 333,21–338,2). When the five *sīlas* are discussed (Vibh-a 382,29–383,35, cf. As 97,9–102,31) it is said that the gravity of an offence depends on circumstances and on the status of persons against whom it is directed. This way of thinking is nearer to Hindu law than to the Vinaya.

320. Besides great similarities between both commentaries there are also differences. In commenting on the Paccayavibhaṅga (Vibh 1–213), Vibh-a frequently uses “lexicon verses” (§ 293), while the *Ñāṇa-vibhaṅga* (Vibh 396–464) is illustrated by stories called *vatthu* as in Dh-p-a (§ 263), Vv-a or Pv-a: e.g. Mahāsoṇattheravatthu, Vibh-a 445,15, which preserves historical memory of the usurper (*cora*, Vibh-a 445,31), the brahmin Tissa, during the time of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya (29–17/89–77 BC).

321. Three Ja are referred to as *vatthus*<sup>528</sup>. They are much shorter than those in the Ja and contain fewer verses. This is a further indication that the Ja collection did not yet exist when the Abhidhamma commentaries were composed (cf. § 316).

The phrase *anuppanne* (sc. *tathāgate*) *Velāma-Vessantara-dānava-sena*, Vibh-a 414,6 contains a hint at the contents of the lost *Velāma-ja* (§ 109, cf. § 270 note 471).

322. Among the commentaries united in the **Ppk-a**, **Kv-a** deserves special attention as an important source for the history of Buddhism. It begins with a survey of Buddhist schools, which contains a quotation from Dīp (Kv-a 1,5\*-8,6\* = Dīp V 29–53). The views expressed in Kv are attributed to different schools (§ 150).

<sup>528</sup> No. 234 Asitābhū-ja, Ja II 229,6–236,12; Vibh-a 470,24–471,3; no. 439 Catudvāra-ja, Ja IV 1,3–6,24; Vibh-a 471,4–472,5; no. 490 Pañcūposatha-ja, Ja IV 325, 16–332,4; Vibh-a 472,6–17.

## VI. The Handbooks

323. The first handbooks in Theravāda are the Parivāra (§ 40), Peṭ (§ 167) and Nett (§ 158). While the Parivāra tries to convey the basic knowledge necessary to handle the Vinaya, Peṭ and Nett are guides to the interpretation of Suttanta texts. Later manuals, the earliest of which are perhaps contemporaneous with Buddhaghosa, are compendia of either Vinaya or Abhidhamma, which appear to have gradually replaced the study of the original texts. There are no later Suttanta handbooks, probably because Vism (§ 245) was considered as the definitive text in this respect.

### VI.1 The Vinaya Handbooks

324. Four manuals, two on Vinaya and Abhidhamma respectively, are attributed to Buddhадатта, who is traditionally seen as a contemporary of Buddhaghosa (§ 327). Buddhадатта is one of the authors of manuals covering both, Vinaya and Abhidhamma (§ 340)<sup>529</sup>, thus following a tradition well known to Sp, where it is said that the Ābhidhammika Godha also decides difficult cases concerning the Vinaya<sup>530</sup>.

**Vinayavinicchaya (Vin-vn: 1.3.3) and Uttaravinicchaya (Utt-vn: 1.3.4):**  
Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta 1928.

Commentary: **Vinayatthasārasandīpanī (Vin-vn-pt: 1.3.3,1):** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I, II (1977); **Uttaralinatthapakāsinī (Utt-vn-ṭ: 1.3.4,2):** Edition: Vin-vn-pt B<sup>e</sup> II (1977) p. 401–530.

325. It is the aim of Vin-vn and Utt-vn to give a summary of Vin and according to Vin-vn-pt also of the Vinaya commentaries which are in

---

<sup>529</sup> Others are Ānanda, though only his Abhidhamma commentaries are known (§ 356), Kassapa Coḷa: Moh (§ 354) and Vmv (§ 338), or Nānakitti (§ 379).

<sup>530</sup> v. Hinüber 1995a: 26 sq. and Sp 1420(a), 25–27 (index).

verses for easy memorizing. At the same time Buddhadatta presupposes a solid knowledge in the Vinaya for all who want to use his handbooks; his standards are considerably higher than later manuals.

Vin-vn follows Vin I–IV closely without, however, covering everything contained in the Khandhaka: Only 14 of the 20 chapters are summarized<sup>531</sup>; e.g. Cullavagga VII Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka is missing without any obvious reason.

The sequence of the texts as found in the Parivāra has been changed considerably in Utt-vn, which sums up this part of the Vin.

326. Both Vin-vn and Utt-vn have also used Sp most probably, because e.g. the Kurundī (§ 210) is quoted in exactly the same places as in Sp. Interestingly, Vin-vn 347 attributes a statement to this commentary and not to *sabbatṭhakathāsu*, Sp 544,12.

After the Bhikkhunīkhandhaka, Buddhadatta adds an appendix of four chapters found in neither Vin nor Sp:

1. Vinayakamma, Vin-vn 2983–3013 on legal procedures of the Saṃgha
2. Kammavipatti, Vin-vn 3014–3028 on possible mistakes in legal procedures
3. Pakiṇṇakanaya, Vin-vn 2029–3124 on miscellaneous matters
4. Kammaṭṭhāna, Vin-vn 3125,3182 on meditation (but cf. § 219).

327. The *nigamana* to Utt-vn names Buddhadatta as the author (Utt-vn 960) and Saṅghapāla as the initiator (Utt-vn 965). The fact that Saṅghapāla is also mentioned by Buddhaghosa (Vism 711,25) in the same function may have contributed to the traditional view that both commentators were contemporaries. It is, however, far from certain whether the rather common name Saṅghapāla designates the same person.

In a colophon in verses it is said that the Thera Sīvali brought a copy of Utt-vn (and Vin-vn?) in Sinhalese characters to Arimaddaka (Pagan), where it was transcribed by the Thera Revata.

328. The *nigamana* on Vin-vn contains much more information: Buddhadatta worked in the Coḷa country in a village Bhūtaṃgaḷa on the bank of the Kāverī in a monastery donated by Veṇḥudāsa (Vin-vn 3168–3171). This is supplemented by the *nigamana* to Abhidh-av

<sup>531</sup> Of course the accounts of both councils are not found in Vin-vn.

(§ 340sq.), in which the town Kāverīpaṭṭana is praised and a monastery founded by Kaṇhadāsa, who might be identical with Veṇḥudāsa (?), is mentioned (Abhidh-av 1409–1412).

The initiator of Vin-vn is Buddhasīha (Vin-vn 3177). The same name also occurs in the *nigamana* to Bv-a (§ 298).

The prose colophon finally identifies the home town of Buddha-datta as Uragapura of uncertain location<sup>532</sup>.

**329.** Much discussed in the general context of South Indian history is the scanty information that Vin-vn was composed during the reign of *Acutavikkante Kalambakulanandane*, Vin-vn 3179<sup>533</sup>. This is the form of the family name of Acutavikkanta (Skr. Acyutavikrānta) of Vin-vn-pt and of most manuscripts with the exception of the oldest one which has Kalabbha. Thus, Acuta may belong either to the Kalabhra or to the Kaṇḍamba dynasty.

The Kaṇḍambas, however, ruled in the western Dekhan, the first known king being Mayūraśarman (340–370): Geography and the names of the kings do not support a connection to this dynasty.

Little is known about the Kalabhras, who according to the early mediaeval Tamil sources destroyed the traditional Hindu order in South India between the 3rd and 6th centuries. As Acutavikkanta appears to be the only name extant of a king of this dynasty, it does not help in dating Vin-vn except that a date later than 600 AD seems to be ruled out.

**330.** The *Vin-vn-pt* is traditionally considered to have been composed by a pupil of the great (sub)commentator Sāriputta active under Parakkamabāhu I. (1153–1186) (§ 373). The introduction says much about Sāriputta, praising his learning: Not only his subcommentaries to Sp and Mp are mentioned but also a *jotisattha* (Skt. *jyotiḥśāstra*) (Vin-vn-pt I 2,2\*-10\*)<sup>534</sup>. No fewer than five initiators are named, for the first time also laymen: 1. Thera Sumaṅgala Araññavāsin (cf. § 343), 2. Thera Buddhamitta Coḷa, 3. Thera Mahākassapasīha Coḷa (§ 354), 4. Upāsaka Dhammakitti Paṇḍita, 4. Vāṇija (“merchant”) Bhāṇu.

<sup>532</sup> Identified by Buddhadatta 1945/1957, who discusses *nigamana* and colophon very uncritically, as Urayūr. For a critique cf. Barua 1945.

<sup>533</sup> Cf. e.g. Arunachalam 1979: 52–55.

<sup>534</sup> Therefore he might be a predecessor of the Sinhalese astrologers mentioned by Bechert 1978: 46.

331. Buddhaghosa and Buddhadatta are expressly called contemporaries (Vin-vn-pt I 2, 17\*-20\*) and the story is told that they met once when Buddhadatta went back from Ceylon to India, while Buddhaghosa was traveling in the opposite direction. Buddhadatta is quoted as requesting from Buddhaghosa a copy of the commentaries when finished, to be used for his own works: *assā pakaraṇaṃ likhāma*, Vin-vn-pt I 9, 23sq.

This anecdote shows that it is assumed traditionally that Buddhaghosa's work slightly antedates Vin-vn etc.

**Khuddakasikkhā (Khuddas: 1.3.1) and Mūlasikkhā (Mūla-s: 1.3.2):** Edition: E.Müller, JPTS 1883<sup>535</sup>.

332. The author of Khuddas is Dhammasiri (Khuddas L 5), who can be dated in relation to Vajirabuddhi (§ 368). An unidentified Burmese tradition attributes Mūla-s to a certain Mahāsāmi, which, however, is a title rather than a personal name<sup>536</sup>.

333. Both manuals are intended for novices (Khuddas *Mātikā* 1, cf. Mūla-s I 1) and have been arranged according to practical purposes. The verses are interrupted by prose<sup>537</sup>, when Kammavācās (§ 28) are quoted.

Both concentrate on the more important rules of the Pātimokkhasutta: Khuddas leaves out Saṃghādisesa X–XIII, and Mūla-s in addition VI and VII, dealing with obsolete rules for building very primitive monasteries. Thus the standard presupposed by these manuals is much lower than in Vin-vn: Khuddas XVIII e.g. corresponds to Vin-vn 2806–2808. The exact relation between Khuddas and Mūla-s on the one hand, and Vin, Sp, and Vin-vn on the other needs investigation<sup>538</sup>.

These texts are mentioned in the Parakkamabāhu-Katikāvata AD 1165: If a monk is unable to memorize the Pātimokkhasutta, Khuddas and two Suttantas, he should learn at least the Sekkhiya rules (§ 16) and Mūla-s<sup>539</sup>, which shows that Mūla-s is considered as a simplified form of Khuddas.

<sup>535</sup> A Khuddasikkhā-ṭ is quoted in Maṇis: § 347.

<sup>536</sup> JPTS 1883: 87.

<sup>537</sup> The wording of the prose at the end of Mūla-s differs from E<sup>o</sup> in two North Thai manuscripts copied in the 18th century.

<sup>538</sup> A rough comparison of these texts has been undertaken by H.Smith in his personal copy of JPTS.

<sup>539</sup> Ratnapala 1971: 130 (§ 6), 131 (§ 7). A Sinhalese translation of Mūla-s seems to be mentioned in a 10th century inscription: Godakumbura 1955: 17.

**Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśaṅgaha** (Pālim: 1.3.5): Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1960.

Commentary: **Vinayaśaṅgahaporāṇaṭṭikā** (Pālim-pt: 1.3.5,1): Edition: C<sup>e</sup> 1908.

Subcommentary: **Vinayālaṅkāraṭṭikā** ([Pālim-nṭ: 1.3.5,12])<sup>540</sup>: Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I,II (1962, repr. 1977).

334. This handbook, which is largely a rearranged Sp, is called Vinayaśaṅgaha “summary of the Vinaya” (Pālim 468,12\*) in the *nigamana*. It is intended as a “Vinayavinicchaya independent from the arrangement of the canonical texts (*pālimuttaka*, cf. § 218 note 390) collecting material found at different places” (Pālim 1,7\*).

Pālim comprises the complete Vinaya material divided for practical purposes into 24 chapters of quite uneven length, such as XIII. Pabbajjāvinicchayaśaṅgaha (Pālim 133–163) or VI. Macchamamsavinicchayaśaṅgaha (Pālim 25–27). As far as this can be ascertained at present, Pālim uses only Vin with Sp. Quotations from the old Aṭṭhakathā seem to be borrowed from Sp.

The royal initiator was Parakkamabāhu I. (1153–1186) (Pālim 468,7\*). No author is mentioned, but the attribution to Sāriputta (Gv 61,31 and Sās 33, 38 = N<sup>e</sup> 31,22) seems trustworthy.

335. Pālim marks the end of comprehensive Vinaya handbooks as does the approximately contemporaneous Moh for the Abhidhamma (§ 354). Vinaya problems continue to be discussed, but without much creativity it seems, because later commentaries appear to be only compilations.

336. **Pālim-pt** which is supposed to be the autocommentary by Sāriputta (Gv 61,32, cf. § 363) is quoted in Maṇis, composed in AD 1466 (§ 347)<sup>541</sup>.

337. **Tipiṭakālaṅkāra**, the author of **Pālim-nṭ**, lived in Ratanapura (Ava) in 17th century Birma under king Sirīsudhamma. It is a rather eloquent commentary containing little new information such as on the pronunciation of Pāli<sup>542</sup>. Occasionally the views of older commentaries are discussed: Vmv (Pālim-nṭ I 130,16; 173,2); Mahāgaṇṭhipada (Pālim-nṭ I 130,15) or Porāṇaṭṭikā (*ibidem*).

338. The last comprehensive treatment of the Vinaya is Vmv, which, although a commentary, is best dealt with here as the Vinaya text

<sup>540</sup> The numbering as 1.3.6.2 CPD (Epil.) is an error, as this text is a subcommentary to Pālim.

<sup>541</sup> Maṇis I 43,14sq. corresponds to de Silva 1938: 9, no. 26, where the beginning of Pālim-pt is communicated; C<sup>e</sup> is inaccessible to me.

<sup>542</sup> v.Hinüber 1987: 104.



corresponding to Kassapa's Abhidhamma manual Moh (§ 354, cf. also § 200):

**Vimativinodanī (Vmv: 1.2,13):** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I, II 1960.

Neither author nor initiator is named in the “Dispeller of Wrong Opinions”, which is traditionally ascribed to Kassapa (Gv 60,32; Sās 33,24=N<sup>e</sup> 31,14). The title occurs in the *nigamana* (Vmv II 322,5\*), which describes Kassapa's programme to write a commentary eliminating the confusion created by his predecessors (*sammohakārīnī*, Vmv I 1,11\*). This may well aim at Sāriputta's Sp-ṭ (§ 373), which is quoted in Vmv and often rejected<sup>543</sup>.

Kassapa is said to have been a native of South India in Sās. This may be based on an interesting remark on the Tamil poem Kuṇḍalakesi-vatthu by the Thera Nāgasena composed “here in Daṃḍaraṭṭha”, propagating wrong views accepted by Sāriputta, but rejected by the Mahāthera Ācariya Buddhappiya (Vmv I 117,20–118,1)<sup>544</sup>, who might be identical with the South Indian grammarian<sup>545</sup>.

Kassapa seems to be a slightly younger contemporary of Sāriputta (cf. § 354)<sup>546</sup>. Consequently he may be identical with one of the initiators of Vin-vn-ṭ (§ 330).

**339.** A group of smaller, more specialized manuals is devoted to problems connected with the *sīmā* “boundary”, determining the area from which all monks have to assemble for legal acts of the Saṃgha<sup>547</sup>.

Only the *Sīmāvivādavinicchaya*kathā (*Sīmāv*: 1.5.4) seems to have been edited so far<sup>548</sup>. This text was composed in Burma in AD 1858 by Ñeyyadhamma (*Sīmāv* 34,4–8). It is written as a letter (*saṃdesa*, *Sīmāv* 34,1, cf. § 438) to the monks of Ceylon.

Two works of Vācissara (cf. § 192) *Sīmālaṅkāra* ([*Sīmāl*]:1.5.1) and *Sīmālaṃkārasaṃgaha* ([*Sīmāl-s*]: 1.5.2)<sup>549</sup> are mentioned in the *Ka-*

<sup>543</sup> Bollée 1969: 834.

<sup>544</sup> Cf. Bapat 1967.

<sup>545</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 220

<sup>546</sup> Bollée 1969: 825.

<sup>547</sup> Kieffer-Pülz 1992.

<sup>548</sup> JPTS 1887: 17–34, cf. Godakumbura 1983: 86sq. A new <sup>j</sup> edition is planned by P.Kieffer-Pülz.

<sup>549</sup> *Sīmāl-s* has been described by Dhirasekera 1970. — On Saddhammajotipāla's *Sīmālaṅkāraṭṭhikā* ([*Sīmāl-ṭ*]: 1.5.1,1) cf. Godakumbura 1969: 4.

yānī inscription in AD 1476 (§ 446), which testifies that Vinaya commentaries and manuals were used in 15th century Birma: Vin, Sp, Sp-ṭ, Vmv, Vjb, Kkh, Kkh-ṭ, Vin-vn, Vin-vn-(p)l, Pālim [Vinayasāṅgha], Sīmālaṅkāra, Sīmālaṅkārasāṅgha are mentioned<sup>550</sup>.

## VI.2 The Abhidhamma Handbooks

**Abhidhammāvatāra (Abhidh-av: 3.8.4) and Rūpārūpavibhāga (Rūpār: 3.8.5):** Edition: A.P. Buddhadatta 1915; translation of Rūpār: R.Exell: The Classification of Forms and Formless Things. Visakha Puja. Bangkok 1964 = JPTS 16.1992: 1–12.

Commentaries on Abhidh-av: **Abhidhammāvatāraporāṇaṭṭikā (A-bhidh-av-pṭ): 3.8.5,1):** Edition: B<sup>3</sup> 1977; **Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (A-bhidh-av-nṭ): 3.8.5,2):** Edition: together with Abhidh-av-pṭ.

**340.** The “Introduction to the Abhidhamma”, which is called a key to the Abhidhamma in the introductory verses (Abhidh-av 1,12\*sq.)<sup>551</sup>, and the “Classification of Forms and Formless Things” are handbooks written by Buddhadatta, as evident from the *nigamanas*, which confirm and supplement the information in Vin-vn and Utt-vn (§ 324,328).

A remark in the introduction to Vism-mhṭ (§ 247) mentioning also the lost **Sumatāvātāra** (Vism-mhṭ N<sup>e</sup> 2,20)<sup>552</sup> “Introduction by Sumati” (§ 448) shows that there may have been more manuals of this type once. At the same time Abhidh-av is defined as an independent work (*pakarāṇa*) here, in contrast to a commentary (*vaṇṇanā*) such as Suv (Vism-mhṭ N<sup>e</sup> 2,18sq.).

**341.** Abhidh-av is composed in a mixture of verse and prose. The end of a chapter has been marked by *triṣṭubh-* instead of the usual *śloka-*verses<sup>553</sup>. Together with Rūpār, which is an extremely brief prose treatise, Abhidh-av is the earliest surviving manual attempting to sum up the contents of the Abhidhamma.

<sup>550</sup> Taw Sein-Ko 1893: 42,9–12.

<sup>551</sup> The title is explained as: *abhidhammaṃ otaranti anenā ti abhidhammāvatāraṃ nāma pakaraṇaṃ. iminā paṇ' assa atthānugataṃ abhidhānaṃ dasseti*, Abhidh-av-nṭ 1 156,1–3.

<sup>552</sup> Thus N<sup>e</sup>, B<sup>e</sup>, S<sup>e</sup>, but Sumanāvatāra, Vism-sn (C<sup>e</sup> 1890) 3b,24, cf. Upās p. 109.

<sup>553</sup> Cf. Mhv: § 186.

Neither Vism nor the Abhidhamma commentaries are explicitly referred to. The relation of Buddhaddatta's manuals to these texts still needs investigation<sup>554</sup>.

**342. Abhidh-av-pṭ** is a comparatively short commentary without introductory verses or *nigamana* traditionally ascribed to Vācissara Mahāsāmitthera (Sās 34,9 = N° 31,27, cf. § 192). It is noteworthy that Abhidh-av-pṭ does not comment on the introductory verses of Abhidh-av.

**343. Abhidh-av-nṭ** is a very comprehensive commentary of more than 700 pages. The author Sumaṅgala of the Nandipariveṇa is named in the *nigamana* (Abhidh-av-nṭ II 378,17\*–19\*). His teacher is the (sub-)commentator Sāriputta of the Jetavana in Pulatthinagara (Polonnaruva) (Abhidh-av-nṭ II 378,2\*–4\*)<sup>555</sup>, whose learning is praised. The expression *madhuratthasārasandīpanamhi*, Abhidh-av-nṭ II 378,12\* seems to allude to Vin-vn-pṭ of another pupil of Sāriputta. It is therefore not unlikely that this Sumaṅgala is mentioned in the introduction to Vin-vn-pṭ as Sumaṅgala Araññavāsī (§ 330). Further, the title of this subcommentary is confirmed (Abhidh-av-nṭ II 378,20\*).

**344.** Seven small Abhidhamma texts form a set in Burma called “little finger manuals” (**lak-san<sup>3</sup>** “let than”: 3.8) or *Lakkhaṇagantha* (Sās 33,36–34,4=N° 31,21–25)<sup>556</sup>. Three are attributed to Anuruddha<sup>557</sup>:

**Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha** (**Abhidh-s: 3.8.1**): Edition: H.Saddhātissa. London 1989; translations: Shwe Zan Aung and C.A.F.Rhys Davids 1910; *Abhidhammattha-Saṅgaha. Ein Kompendium buddhistischer Philosophie. Üb. v. Brahmacari Govinda* [E.L.Hoffmann]. München 1931; *A Manual of Abhidhamma. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* trsl. by Nārada. Rangoon 1970, rev. by Bhikkhu Bodhi. Kandy 1993.

<sup>554</sup> Norman 1983: 124 note 157 draws attention to the parallel Abhidh-av 2,33–3,14 to As 62,1–17.

<sup>555</sup> There is some confusion about Sumaṅgala's date in Pieris 1978: 73sq., who takes him to be a contemporary Dhammapāla (cf. § 370)(!) and Ānanda Vanaratana (*recte*: Araññaratana, 12th century) to be identical with Ānanda the first subcommentator (§ 356)(!), but cf. Upās p. 35.

<sup>556</sup> Nāmar-s, JPTS 11.1987: 5.

<sup>557</sup> Anuruddha's works have been united in B° 1962 together with Sacc.

Commentary: **Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī** (**Abhidh-s-mhṭ**: 3.8.1,2): Edition: together with **Abhidh-s**<sup>558</sup>; **Maṇisāramañjūsā** (**Maṇis**: 3.8.1,21): Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I (1963), II (1964), cf. Bollée 1968a: 313<sup>559</sup>; **Abhidhammatthasaṅgahadīpanī** (**Abhidh-s-abhinava-ṭ**: 3.8.1,4): Edition: cf. Bollée 1968a: 314 and: Abhidharma Research Institute Kiyō. Kyoto. 9. 1990: 1–9.

345. Anuruddha, whose date is uncertain (10th/11th century)<sup>560</sup>, tries to give in short, *sūtra*-like sentences a comprehensive but brief survey of the complete Abhidhamma, which has secured the lasting popularity of his work extant in very early manuscripts<sup>561</sup>. The title and the initiator, the layman Namba (**Abhidh-s** 51,8\*; **Abhidh-s-mhṭ** 211,5; but Nambha, Gv 71,7), are mentioned in the *nigamana*, the name of the author appears only in the colophon.

346. The author of **Abhidh-s-mhṭ** is probably Sumaṅgala (§ 330, 343,373)<sup>562</sup>: The *nigamana* of **Abhidh-s-mhṭ** 212,2\*-16\* is identical with that of **Abhidh-av-ṇ** II 378,\*2–16\* (cf. § 343). The work, in which lost commentaries seem to have been used (**Abhidh-a-mhṭ** 53,18\*), was finished within the astonishingly short time of 24 days (**Abhidh-s-mhṭ** 212,25\*).

347. **Maṇis** was composed by Ariyavaṃsa(dhammasenāpati) living in the Dhammakapabbata monastery on the banks of the Irawaddy in AD 1466 according to the *nigamana* (**Maṇis** II 480,13)<sup>563</sup>. A considerable number of texts, mostly *Ṭikās*, are quoted, e.g.:

Jātakatṭhakathā-ṭ, **Maṇis** I 24,10 (cf. § 261,359)

Khuddasikkhā-ṭ, **Maṇis** I 32,3

Vinayaśaṅgaha-ṭ, **Maṇis** I 43,14; Vinayavinicchaya-(p)ṭ, **Maṇis** I 63,8 (cf. § 336)

Netti-gp, **Maṇis** I 55,22 (cf. § 158).

<sup>558</sup> For 3.8.1,22 **Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y**: § 380.

<sup>559</sup> On **Abhidh-s-Saṅkhepavajjana** (**Abhidh-s-sv**: 3.8.1,3): Edition: C<sup>e</sup> 1930; cf. Godakumbura 1969: 2 sq. and § 442 n. 733.

<sup>560</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 168sq.; Bechert 1979b: 26.

<sup>561</sup> The first was copied about AD 1500, perhaps even in the 15th century, and is preserved at Vat Lai Hin; the second one is dated AD 1571: JSS 75.1987: 38, no. 37.

<sup>562</sup> **Abhidh-s** p. XVIII, cf. Gv 62,18–21.

<sup>563</sup> On another Ariyavaṃsa: § 427.

This indicates a high standard of encyclopaedic learning, but it shows at the same time that secondary literature begins to prevail over canonical texts. The quotations are occasionally also valuable for dating later texts.

**Abhidh-s-abhi-nava-ṭ** was written in Salin (Upper Burma) in AD 1801 by Sīlācāra<sup>564</sup>.

**Paramatthavinicchaya (Pm-vn: 3.8.2):** Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta, JPTS 10.1985: 155–226.

**Nāmarūpapariccheda (Nāmar-p: 3.8.3):** Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta, JPTS 1913/14: 1–114.

**348. Pm-vn** is another handbook of the whole Abhidhamma in 39 Paricchedaś and 1146 verses. The author, the South Indian Anuruddha from Kāverīnagara (Kāverīpaṭṭana) in the kingdom of Kāñci, who lived in the town Tañja in Tamba (Ceylon?), is named in the *nigamana* (Pm-vn 1143–1146). Also the title of the text and the Mahāvihāra are mentioned. The initiator was Saṅghaviseṭṭha.

**349.** Only the colophon of **Namar-p** mentions Anuruddha as the author. This treatise covers only part of the Abhidhamma in 1845 verses, and is based on earlier commentaries: *Mahāvihāravāsīnaṃ vaṇṇanāyananissitaṃ*, Nāmar-p 2.

**350.** It is not entirely certain that all three works were composed by Anuruddha: Abhidh-s-mhṭ 111,29–35 discusses a (pretended?) contradiction between Pm-vn and Abhidh-s/Nāmar-p. Consequently, A.P.Buddhadatta is inclined to attribute the texts to different authors<sup>565</sup>.

The date of Anuruddha is uncertain. The author of the Sanskrit Anuruddhaśataka is certainly a different person<sup>566</sup>.

<sup>564</sup> There are numerous unedited commentaries on Abhidh-s: CPD (Epil.) 3.8.1,2–3.8.1,(6) and the anonymous (initiator: Siribhadda) *Abhidhammatthasārūpa-ka* ([Abhidh-sār: 3.8. 1,7]) on the *saṅgahagāthās* only preserved in the National Library, Bangkok.

<sup>565</sup> JPTS 10.1985: 158. The same passage is discussed in B<sup>c</sup> 1962, p. *kha* without disputing Anuruddha's authorship.

<sup>566</sup> Bechert 1979b: 26.

**Saccasaṅkhepa (Sacc: 3.8.6):** Edition: P.Dhammārāma, JPTS 1917/1919: 1–25.

351. The text is attributed to Ānanda (§ 356) in Saddh-s IX 16 in about AD 1400 in Siam (§ 4), but to his pupil Dhammapāla in Maṇis I 377,23–25; 407,20 in AD 1466 in Burma (§ 347) and in Gv 60,30sq. It contains 387 verses on Abhidhamma divided into five Paricchadas.

**Nāmarūpasamāsa (Nāmar-s: 3.8.8):** Edition: P.Dhammārāma, JPTS 1915/16: 1–19; translation: The Summary of Mind and Matter trsl. by H. Saddhātissa, JPTS 11.1987: 5–31.

352. This short prose treatise is attributed to Khema and consequently also called Khemappakaraṇa. The date is not known<sup>567</sup>.

**Nāmacārādīpaka (Nāmac: 3.8.9):** Edition: H.Saddhātissa, JPTS 15.1990: 1–28.

353. The “(Explaining the) Action of Mind” (Saddhātissa) consists of 299 verses in seven Paricchadas. It is attributed by the *nigamana* to Saddhammajotipāla, who lived in Arimaddananagara (Pagan) (Nāmac 28,3) in the 15th century<sup>568</sup>, and who is the author of a number of commentaries on both Vinaya and Abhidhamma<sup>569</sup>.

**Mohavicchedanī (Moh: 3.8.7):** Edition: A.P.Buddhadatta and A.K. Warder 1961.

354. The “Destroyer of Doubt” is a very lucid commentary on the *mātikās* (§ 131) of all seven canonical Abhidhamma texts and it is therefore also called Abhidhammamātikatthavaṇṇanā. It is based on the canonical texts together with their commentaries (Moh 1,18\*).

The name of the author, Kassapa, occurs encoded as *dhutadharaggasamāna*, Moh 359,28\* “similar to the foremost practitioners of

<sup>567</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 10th century?

<sup>568</sup> Cf. Godakumbura 1969: 5, where “14th century” appears twice by mistake for 15th century.

<sup>569</sup> His works are numerated JPTS 15.1990: 1sq., where he is however confused by Saddhātissa with Chapaṭa (I), who lived in the 12th century and figures prominently in the Kalyāṇī inscription: Taw Sein-Ko 1893. In contradistinction to Chapaṭa (II) Saddhammajotipāla (cf. § 442), no literary works of the earlier Chapaṭa are extant.

*dhutaṅgas*” (Moh p. X). He lived on the banks of the Kāverī in the Coḷa country in the Nāgānanavihāra (Nāgajjuna°, B° 1977) built by Rājādhirāja (I. [?]: 1014–1044; II. [?]: 1173–1179) (Moh 359,6\*.8\*.27\*). If he is the person mentioned in the introduction to Vin-vn-ṭ (§ 330), Moh was probably written about AD 1200<sup>570</sup>.

Further, Vmv is also ascribed to Kassapa (§ 338).

---

<sup>570</sup> Cf. Moh p. XI.

## VII. The Subcommentaries

355. After an interval of uncertain length it was felt necessary by the Mahāvihāra community to add subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*)<sup>571</sup> first of all to the Abhidhamma commentaries. Soon Suttanta subcommentaries followed, which form a unit together with the first *anuṭṭikās* on the Abhidhamma commentaries. These successive sets were written by Ānanda and Dhammapāla respectively.

### VII.1 The Subcommentaries by Ānanda

**Atthasālinī-mūlaṭṭīkā** (As-mṭ: 3.1,11): Edition: B° 1962; **Vibhaṅgamūlaṭṭīkā** (Vibh-mṭ: 3.2,11)<sup>572</sup>: Edition: B° 1960; **Pañcappakaraṇamūlaṭṭīkā** (Ppk-mṭ): Edition: B° 1960.

356. Ānanda, who lived in the otherwise unknown Kalasapura<sup>573</sup>, can be dated approximately by the help of Vjb (§ 368).

His “basic commentaries”, as they are named because they are the first of their kind (Sās 33,17=N° 31,8sq.), were originally also called *Līnatthajotikā* “Illustrator of the Hidden Meaning” (As-mṭ 203,12\*, cf. § 357) or *Līnatthapadavaṇṇanā* “Explanation of Words with a Hidden Meaning” as in the colophon, or *Paramatthapakāsanī* in *Saddh-* 60,5–20.

They begin abruptly without any introduction. A verse colophon is found only at the end of As-mṭ, where Ānanda is mentioned as the author and the initiator *Dhammamitta*.

According to *Vajirabuddhi*, Ānanda was also an expert in the *Vinaya* (§ 368, cf. § 324). The commentator *Dhammapāla* was perhaps his pupil (§ 366).

<sup>571</sup> On the *ṭīkā* literature cf. Sv-pt I, p. XXVIII–XLI; on the terminology cf. § 203. It is hardly possible to benefit from Jayawardhana 1995.

<sup>572</sup> *Vibh-mṭ* and *Vibh-anuṭ* N° 1987 is a mere transcript of B°.

<sup>573</sup> Cf. Bollée 1969: 832 note 48.



## VII.2 The Subcommentaries by Dhammapāla

357. Besides the Paramatthadīpanī (§ 272), Dhammapāla wrote subcommentaries, among them those on the commentaries by Buddhaghosa on the first four Nikāyas according to Gv 60,11 and Piṭ-sm no. 199–201. However, Mp-pṭ is not mentioned in Sās 33,20=N<sup>e</sup> 31,10sq. and, if it ever existed, does not seem to survive (§ 375). Moreover, the subcommentaries to the Mūlaṭṭikās of his teacher Ānanda (§ 356) and others are ascribed to him traditionally:

**Līnatthappakāsinī I: Sv-pṭ: 2.1,11:** Edition: L. de Silva. I–III. London 1970 [rev.: L. Cousins 1972]; **II: Ps-pṭ: 2.2,1:** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I–III 1962; **III: Spk-pṭ: 2.3,11:** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> I, II 1961.

358. The subcommentaries themselves do not contain colophons or *nigamanas* indicating an author. They have been connected with Dhammapāla at least since the 12th century<sup>574</sup>: *līnatthapakāsinīyaṃ ācariya-Dhammapālen' eva vuttaṃ*, Sp-ṭ I 41,2 refers to Spk-pṭ II 162,18<sup>575</sup>. It seems that the title was chosen purposefully, because these subcommentaries on Suttantas supplement Ānanda's Līnatthajotikā (§ 356) on the Abhidhamma.

359. The Līnatthappakāsinī also comprises a subcommentary to Ja, which exists only in manuscript form (**Ja-pṭ: 2.5.10,11** cf. § 261). A quotation from Ja-pṭ on Ja I 1,23\* in Maṇis I 24,10–12 (§ 347) is identical with the text found in the manuscript referred to in CPD (Epil.) 2.5.10,11.

360. Dhammapāla himself is also credited with a subcommentary on Ānanda's Līnatthajotikā:

**Līnatthavaṇṇanā I: As-anuṭ: 3.1,12; II: Vibh-anuṭ: 3.2,12; III–VII: Ppk-anuṭ: 3.3,12–3.7,12:** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> together with the respective Mūlaṭṭikās.

The “Explanation of the Hidden Meaning”, a title also used for Nett-pṭ (§ 363), contains neither introductory nor concluding verses.

<sup>574</sup> Sv-pṭ, p. XLI, LII.

<sup>575</sup> *mātikatṭhakathāyaṃ līnatthapakāsinīyaṃ*, Sp-ṭ III 274, 19sq. seems to refer to an otherwise unknown Kkh commentary by Dhammapāla: Bollée 1969: 825, cf. § 378.

There is, however, an indication that these commentaries were indeed written by Dhammapāla, for it is said in the Paramatthadīpanī: *vit-thāro ... kathāvatthupakaraṇassa tīkāya gahetabbo*, Ud-a 94,9 referring to Ppk-anuṭ (Kv-anuṭ) 122,14sq., and **not** to Ānanda's Ppk-mṭ (Kv-mṭ) as erroneously assumed by Cousins 1972: 162 in his important discussion on the subcommentaries. This crucial cross reference seems to guarantee the unity of this set of subcommentaries as works of Dhammapāla.

**361.** Dhammapāla further composed commentaries on two non-canonical texts, Vism (§ 245) and Nett (§ 158):

**Paramatthamañjūsā (Vism-mhṭ: 2.8.1,1):** Editions: s. Vism § 245.

The commentary on Vism was written at the initiative of the Thera Dāṭhanāga, who lived in the Siddhagāmapariveṇa (Vism-mhṭ N° I 3,19\*; III 1691,9\*). At the end this commentary the Dhammapāla colophon is found (§ 274).

**Nettiatṭhakathā (Nett-a: 2.7.2,1):** B° 1960; cf. Nett E° 194–263.

**362.** The unity of Nett-a, which was created at the initiative of the Thera Dhammarakkhita (Nett-a 1,14\*), and Dhammapāla's Paramatthadīpanī is guaranteed by the partly identical, partly similar introductory verses. Nett-a emphasises that it relies on the four Nikāyas and on "Peṭaka", Nett-a (B°) 2,8\*; 3,19<sup>576</sup>. The same is true for the concluding verses, where it is said that the author lived in the Dhammāso-kārāma in Nāgapaṭṭana, Nett (E°) 249,19\*sq. = Nett-a (B°) 275,23\*sq. At the very end the Dhammapāla colophon (§ 274) was added.

**363.** Following the tradition, Dhammapāla wrote also a Tīkā to his own Nett-a:

**Līnatthavaṇṇanā (Nett-pt: 2.7.2,11):** B° 1962 together with Nett-ṭ: § 389.

The beginning of this commentary, which has neither introductory nor concluding verses, is identical with the opening passage common to the three parts of Līnatthappakāsinī (§ 358), and it is even

<sup>576</sup> Explained as "Peṭakopadesa", Nett-pt 18,21; cf. § 171.

called *Īnatthappakāsinī* in Gv 60,5.13, where both, *Nett-a* and *Nett-pt*, are ascribed to Dhammapāla, while Sās 33,10=N° 31,2sq. does not mention *Nett-pt*. As it was rare that the same person composed a subcommentary to his own commentary, modern research tends to reject the authorship of Dhammapāla for *Nett-pt*<sup>577</sup>. However, Sāriputta is supposed to have written an autocommentary on Pālim (§ 336), and this is not that unusual in Indian literature. Therefore, the question cannot be answered, as long as the relation between *Nett-a* and *Nett-pt* and to other works of Dhammapāla has not been thoroughly investigated.

**364.** Once the *Paramatthadīpanī* and the *Īnatthavaṇṇanā* on the *Abhidhamma* commentaries are connected by a cross reference, the theory of two different Dhammapālas collapses and the whole problem of the unity of these commentaries has to be discussed anew.

**365.** The date of Dhammapāla remains uncertain. A *terminus post quem* is given by the quotation of Bhartṛhari: *Vākyapadīya* I 37 in Sv-pt III 119,13\*, because the grammarian can perhaps be dated about 450–510<sup>578</sup>. This would confirm that Dhammapāla was younger than Buddhaghosa (§ 286; 306), and that he worked after AD 500. A reliable *terminus ante quem*, however, is difficult to find<sup>579</sup>, for the first certain date is provided by Sāriputta, who knows Dhammapāla's works in the 12th century<sup>580</sup>.

**366.** Finally it should be mentioned that (this?) Dhammapāla is seen as the pupil of Ānanda by the tradition when Sacc (§ 351) is attributed to Culladhammapāla or to his teacher Ānanda (Gv 60,30sq. and Sās 34,1=N° 31,24)<sup>581</sup>. However, as the *Mūlaṭṭkā* and Sacc contradict *Vism-mhṭ* and *Spk-pt* in one particular point<sup>582</sup>, Dhammapāla appears to be the more likely choice as an author.

<sup>577</sup> Nett p. IX note 6; Norman 1983: 149.

<sup>578</sup> Scharfe 1977: 170.

<sup>579</sup> The reference to the originally probably Iranian concept of *saṃsāramocaka*, Pv II 1 (Pv-a 67,1–78,4) does not prove helpful for dating Dhammapāla, cf. Halbfäß 1991: 109.

<sup>580</sup> The attempts by H.Saddhātissa, Upās p. 29 to use the initiator Dāṭhanāga (§ 361) to find a date, have been rightly rejected in Sv-pt p. XLVII sq.; cf. also § 370.

<sup>581</sup> However, Pieris 1978: 73 suggests that they were rather “rival teachers”.

<sup>582</sup> Cousins 1972: 161.

That Ānanda was his teacher seems to be confirmed by an interesting observation made by L.de Silva<sup>583</sup>: Dhammapāla says *Ānandācariyo avoca*, Sp-pt III 85,22 referring to As-mṭ 75,24: If the unusual aorist instead of the common past participle is used according to Pāṇini 3.3.175, it should refer to the near past. If so, a relative chronology could be reached at by the help of Vjb.

### VII.3 The Vinayagaṇṭhipada by Vajirabuddhi

**Vajirabuddhiṭkā** (Vjb: 1.2,11): Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1962.

**367.** Although this commentary is generally called a Ṭikā, the author himself takes it to be a Gaṇṭhipada (§ 203), because he says at the end: *samantapāsādikasaññitāya vinayaṭṭhakathāya ... gaṇṭhiṭṭhānavikāsanā*, Vjb 584,8<sup>584</sup>. It is an important, though so far hardly used source for the Vinaya interpretation between Sp<sup>585</sup> and Sāriputta and consequently for the history of Buddhist law.

Generally Vjb discussed different opinions in contrast to Sāriputta, who summarizes his predecessors (§ 374)<sup>586</sup>.

**368.** Although nothing is known about the author, his position in Pāli literature can be determined fairly well thanks to an excellent article by Bollée 1969: Vjb quotes and defines the following sources<sup>587</sup>: *ācariya* referring to Ānanda from Kalasapura (Vjb 36,16–19, cf. § 356); *gaṇṭhipada* referring to Dhammasiri (Vjb 95,29sq.); *anugaṇṭhipada* referring to Vjb (Vjb 96,2sq.)<sup>588</sup>. Moreover, Vjb quotes from a *Porāṇagaṇṭhipada*, which was already known to Dhammasiri (Vjb 507,23). As Ānanda refers to Dhammasiri (Vjb 52,11sq.; 140,22), the following sequence of texts can be inferred:

Porāṇagaṇṭhipada – Dhammasirigaṇṭhipada – Ānanda – Vajirabuddhi.

<sup>583</sup> Sv-pt p. XLIV.

<sup>584</sup> Cf. *vinayagaṇṭhipada*, Sās 34,19=N<sup>e</sup> 32,8.

<sup>585</sup> On the sources of Sp enumerated in Vjb: § 210.

<sup>586</sup> Bollée 1969: 834.

<sup>587</sup> These passages are listed Vjb B<sup>e</sup> 629. Quotations found in Vjb are also listed Upās p. 54

<sup>588</sup> This is possibly a second lost work by Vajirabuddhi.

Further, the Theras Upatissa and Buddhamitta, who were perhaps contemporary with Dhammasiri are considered as authorities by Vjb<sup>589</sup>.

369. As Bollée succeeded in identifying the verse Vjb 284,26\*sq. as Khuddas XI 4, and as this and two further verses from Khuddas found in Sp-ṭ are attributed to Dhammasiri<sup>590</sup>, there can be hardly any doubt about the identity of this Dhammasiri with the author of Khuddas. Consequently, Dhammasiri, who besides Khuddas also wrote a Gaṇṭhipada, is earlier than Ānanda from Kalasapura. This rare place name seems almost to confirm the identity with the author of the Abhidh-mṭ (§ 356), who is considered the teacher of Dhammapāla, a scholar never quoted in Vjb. Therefore, Vajirabuddhi and Dhammapāla may have been contemporaries, and, moreover, both may be South Indians, if the occasional ignorance of Dhammapāla concerning North Indian geography is taken into consideration<sup>591</sup>.

370. It is impossible to convert this relative chronology into an absolute one. If Dhammapāla could be dated somewhere about AD 550–600 (cf. § 307)<sup>592</sup>, this might be the approximate date for Vajirabuddhi as well<sup>593</sup>. Ānanda could be about fifty years older as the teacher of Dhammapāla and Dhammasiri again antedates Dhammapāla, but is later than Buddhaghosa. Thus all these commentators might have lived within the brackets of AD 450 and AD 600<sup>594</sup>.

371. The only hint to the home of Vajirabuddhi discovered so far is his apparently intimate knowledge of certain parts of South India: In explaining a certain type of *sīmā* (cf. § 339) he refers to the Khandhadhamma monastery in Kāñcī and to the Sāridhamma monastery in Kāverīpaṭṭana (Vjb 359,10sq. on Sp 913,3sq.). Moreover, Vajirabuddhi had access to South Indian books: *andhakapotthake sīhaḷapotthakesu*

<sup>589</sup> Bollée 1969: 832.

<sup>590</sup> Bollée 1969: 833 with note 61.

<sup>591</sup> Cf. Norman, Thī-trsl. § 37, p. XXXVI following a suggestion by C.A.F.Rhys Davids. On Vajirabuddhi's home: § 371.

<sup>592</sup> Pieris 1978: 74 is also inclined to date Dhammapāla in the 6th century.

<sup>593</sup> Bollée 1969: 826, however, is inclined to date Vjb only slightly earlier than Sp-ṭ.

<sup>594</sup> Cf. § 307. According to the grammatical terminology L. de Silva, Sv-pt p. XLVI is inclined to date Dhammapāla nearer to Buddhaghosa.

*ca kesuci pāṭho*, Vjb 457,27sq. “a variant (found) in a manuscript from Āndhra and in some Sinhalese manuscripts”.

#### VII.4 The Subcommentaries by Sāriputta and his pupil Buddhanāga

**372.** The most important event concerning the religious and consequently also literary history of the 12th century are the reforms by Parakkamabāhu I. (1153–1186), uniting the Saṃgha and finally giving predominance to the Mahāvihāra orthodoxy<sup>595</sup>. As a purification of the Saṃgha means first of all imposing strict Vinaya rules, the learned monk Sāriputta<sup>596</sup> was entrusted by the king himself to write Pālim as a handbook (§ 334) and to compose a Ṭīkā on Sp<sup>597</sup>:

**Sāratthadīpanī (Sp-ṭ: 1.2,12):** Edition: B° I (1961), II (1960), III (1960).

**373.** Although no author is named in Sp-ṭ itself, the anonymous author, who composed Vin-vn-pṭ refers to this subcommentary as Sāriputta’s work, who was his teacher.

Sāriputta lived in a building erected for him in the Jetavana monastery built by Parakkamabāhu I. (Mhv LXXVIII 34). The same information is given in the *nigamana* to Sp-ṭ, thus confirming Sāriputta as the author (Sp-ṭ III 496,11\*).

The introductory verses mention Parakkamabāhu and his successful efforts to unite the Saṃgha (Sp-ṭ I 1,9\*sq.). Further, Kassapa is named as the *saṃghassa pariṇāyakaṃ*, Sp-ṭ I 1,11\* and the Anutthera Sumedha (cf. § 378) as Sāriputta’s teacher (Sp-ṭ I 1,17\*).

The title of Sp-ṭ is given by the author as Līnasāratthadīpanī (Sp-ṭ I 2,3\*), but mostly the abbreviated form is used.

**374.** Sāriputta writes his systematic new subcommentary, planned to be brief, but comprehensive (Sp-ṭ I 2,15\*sq.), because older works no

<sup>595</sup> These events discussed by Bechert 1993 are related in Mhv LXXIII 12–22 and LXXVIII 1–27 confirmed by epigraphical evidence: Ratnapala 1971: 127–135, by the introduction to Sp-ṭ (§ 373) and the *nigamana* to Kkh-ṭ (§ 378).

<sup>596</sup> On Sāriputta: § 330, 343, 346, 378; cf. also Rohanadeera: 1985: 27–30.

<sup>597</sup> Bollée 1969: 825.

longer serve the purpose of the monks in the 12th century. Particularly the Gaṇṭhipadas written in Sinhalese are difficult to understand (Sp-ṭ I 2,5\*-8\*) and therefore summarized in Pāli. This interesting remark underlines the age of these commentaries, which should have been well over 500 years old in Sāriputta's time.

Sāriputta's programme thus differs markedly from Vajirabuddhi's, against whom he polemicized at times in a rather harsh form<sup>598</sup>.

375. Sāriputta is sometimes credited with a complete set of Suttanta subcommentaries called Sāratthamañjūsā. Only the subcommentary on Mp seems to actually exist:

**Sāratthamañjūsā Aṅguttaraṭṭhikā (Mp-ṭ: 2.4,12):** Edition: B° I (1960), II (1962), III (1962).

The introductory and concluding verses are largely identical with those of Sp-ṭ. It is also said that the initiator was Parakkamabāhu (Mp-ṭ III 370,15\*). The title is confirmed by the *nigamana* (Mp-ṭ III 270,14\*), but no author is mentioned.

376. It seems that only this single Suttanta subcommentary was written by Sāriputta. For the supposed Sāratthamañjūsā on Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt seems to be a fiction<sup>599</sup>: These subcommentaries, listed without reference to any source in CPD (Epil.), are neither mentioned in Sās 33,22 = N° 31,13 nor in Piṭ-sm. Already Sāriputta's anonymous pupil (§ 330) and Dhammakitti, a second pupil of his, who composed Dāṭh (§ 193: Dāṭh 151,6\*<sup>600</sup>), know only of Mp-ṭ. Moreover, no subcommentary by Dhammapāla on Mp survives (§ 357). Consequently Mp-ṭ appears to fill a gap and to substitute an earlier lost (?) Mp-pt.

377. Sāriputta's subcommentaries are supplemented by Buddhānāga, who was his pupil<sup>601</sup>. He wrote a subcommentary to:

<sup>598</sup> Bollée 1969: 826sq.

<sup>599</sup> Based on Saddh-s 59,23–60,4 (?); cf. Saddh-s 61,21\*sq.; this is preceded by a quotation of the introductory verses to Sp-ṭ I 2,7\*–16\*=Saddh-s 61,9\*–20\*; cf. also Malalasekera 1928: 192. Geiger 1916: 38 (§ 31 literature) ascribes the Līnatthapakāsa-nā erroneously to Sāriputta, cf. § 358.

<sup>600</sup> It is not entirely impossible that this Dhammakitti also enlarged Mhv (§ 182). — Further works of Sāriputta, who also wrote in Skt. (cf. his *jōtisattha*, § 330), are mentioned Dāṭh 151,2\*–9\*.

<sup>601</sup> Bollée 1969: 827.

**Kaṅkhāvitaraṇāporāṇaṭṭhikā (Kkh-pt: 1.1,11):** Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1965.

The very brief introduction might mention *Līnapadavikāśaka* (Kkh-pt 1,6\*) as the title of this anonymous commentary. It is later than Vjb, which is quoted extensively<sup>602</sup>. Moreover, *Porāṇagaṇṭhipada*, *Gaṇṭhipada*, and *Anugaṇṭhipada* were used (Kkh-pt 31,21.9.10). Once an opinion of the Thera Upatissa is quoted (Kkh-pt 80,10–13) with slightly longer text than the one found in the corresponding quotation in Vjb 247,12sq.

**Vinayatthamañjūsā (Kkh-t: 1.1,12):** Edition: together with Kkh-pt.

**378.** This subcommentary contains a lengthy *nigamana* beginning with a *praśasti* of Parakkamabāhu. Buddhanāga, who names himself as the author (Kkh-t 488,25\*), lived in Polannaruva in the Coḷakulindaka *pariveṇa* (Kkh-t 487,18\*; 488,19\*). He is a pupil of the Mahāthera and Mahāsāmi<sup>603</sup> Sāriputta (Kkh-t 488,22\*) and was asked to compose the subcommentary by the Thera Sumedha (Kkh-t 488,24\*), who could be identical with Sāriputta's teacher (§ 373). The full title is *Vinayatthamañjūsā Līnatthappakāsanī Mātikaṭṭhakathā* (Kkh-t 489,1\*sq.). It is not identical with the *Līnatthappakāsinī* quoted Sp-t III 274,19, where Kkh 8,10 with a subcommentary is referred to. The text quoted matches neither Kkh-pt 6,5–12 nor Kkh-t 148,14–18, both on Kkh 8,10 (cf. § 358 note 575).

## VII.5 Later Subcommentaries

**379.** The tradition to comment on both *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma* (§ 324) is continued by Ñāṇakitti, who lived in the *Panasārāma*<sup>604</sup> northwest of Chiang Mai (*Abhinavapura*) by the end of the 15th century and composed subcommentaries called *atthayojanā* “interpretation explaining the construction”:

<sup>602</sup> Bollée 1969: 827. Vjb is referred to by *likhita*, Kkh-pt 4,9.

<sup>603</sup> On this title: Rohanadeera 1985.

<sup>604</sup> This monastery is said to have been founded by the King Siri Tibhuvanādiccadhammarāja (*Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y* 408,2). This name seems to refer to King Tiloka (1142–1487) as H.Penth, Chiang Mai, suggests. The exact location of this monastery is unknown: It may have been situated either northwest of Chiang Mai or in the northwestern part of this city.



**Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā (Sp-y: 1.2,14):** Edition: S<sup>e</sup> I (1979), II (1960) [both repr. of earlier ed.]; **Atthasālinī-atthayojanā (As-y<sup>2</sup>: 3.1, 15<sup>2</sup>):** Edition: C<sup>e</sup> 1900; B<sup>e</sup> 1927; **Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā-atthayojanā (Vibh-a-y<sup>2</sup>: 3.2,15<sup>2</sup>):** Edition: C<sup>e</sup> 1892; B<sup>e</sup> 1926.

As a grammarian<sup>605</sup> Ñāṇakitti concentrates in his commentaries on grammatical details and seems to contribute little to the understanding of the text as such<sup>606</sup>.

Sp-y and As-y end in almost identical *nigamanas* and in the typical Ñāṇakitti colophon containing the name of the author and his monastery<sup>607</sup>. As-y was finished in nine months (As-y B<sup>e</sup> 249,15\*).

**380.** According to Cœdès 1915: 41, **Dhātuk-y: 3.3,15** survives in manuscript form and was composed in AD 1493/4<sup>608</sup>. Thus this text is a little older than:

**[Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-atthayojanā (Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y: 3.8.1,22)]:** Edition: S<sup>e</sup> I–III (1977 [repr. of earlier ed.]).

This text containing a *nigamana* corresponding to the one of both As-y and Vibh-a-y was finished in BE 2045 : AD 1502 or CS 804 : 1442(!)<sup>609</sup>. It was written at the initiative of the monk Suddhasīla (Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y I 1,7\*) and may also be a work of Ñāṇakitti<sup>610</sup>. The name of this Atthayojanā on Abhidh-s-mhṭ (§ 346) is also given as *pañcika nāma atthayojanā*, Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y III 593,4, but cf. 594,2\*.

**381.** An otherwise unknown Saddhammapāla<sup>611</sup> wrote a subcommentary to Nett:

<sup>605</sup> He also wrote 5.1,42 Kaccāyanarūpadīpanī extant in a manuscript copied AD 1588 preserved at Vat Sung Men, Phrae. This text was also written in the Panasārāma founded by King (Ti)bhuvanadhammarāja as mentioned in the colophon.

<sup>606</sup> A specimen of Sp-y is reproduced in v.Hinüber 1987:110sq.

<sup>607</sup> Reproduced in part by Cœdès 1915: 40sq., where further works by Ñāṇakitti are mentioned.

<sup>608</sup> Dhātuk-y mentioned in Cœdès 1966: 10 seems to be a second Yojanā.

<sup>609</sup> Abhidh-s-mhṭ III 593,5–7: The second date is an error by exactly one 60 years cycle.

<sup>610</sup> Thus Saddhātissa 1974: 215.

<sup>611</sup> Or: Sambandhapāla, Nett-mhṭ 355 note; Samantapāla, Nett p. XXXV note, where the colophon is communicated.

**Nettivibhāvanī** (Nett-ṭ: 2.7.2,12): Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1962 (together with Nett-pt, cf. § 363).

In contrast to Nett-pt, which explains Nett-a, Saddhammapāla, who was a Mahāthera and Mahādhammarājaguru (Nett-ṭ 355,25), wrote a direct commentary on Nett frequently relying on Nett-a and sometimes also quoting from Nett-pt<sup>612</sup>.

Nett-ṭ was finished in AD 1564 (Nett-ṭ 355,27; 356,4\*sq.)<sup>613</sup> and was composed at the initiative of the minister (*amacca*, Nett-t 1,17\*) Anantasuti (Nett-ṭ 1,18\*) of a king called Mahādhammarāja (Nett-ṭ 1,11\*)<sup>614</sup>.

**382.** A late subcommentary on the *Sīlakkhandhavagga* of DN (§ 52) was written by the Burmese Saṃgharāja Ṇāṇābhivaṃsa Dhammase-nāpati Dhammarājādhirājaguru around AD 1800 (Sās 134,29–135,13=N<sup>e</sup> 124,5–16):

**Sādhujjana]vilāsinī** (Sv-nṭ: 2.1,13): Edition B<sup>e</sup> I (1961), II (1960).

This author, who composed Sv-nṭ after becoming Saṃgharāja, is also credited with further works in Sās, among them an *Atthayojanā* on Ja, which appears to be an explanation written in Burmese<sup>615</sup>.

The title is given as *Sādhuvilāsinī* in the introductory verses and in the long *nigamana* (Sv-nṭ I 2,4\*; II 436,5\*), which also contains information on monasteries in Amarapura (Mandalay) built by the founder of the city, King Bodawpaya (1782–1819).

A lost(?) Nett (§ 158) commentary called *Peṭakālaṃkāra* (Nett-mhṭ: 2.7.2,13) by Ṇāṇābhivaṃsa is also mentioned (Sv-nṭ II 437,15\*). He also composed Sand-k (§ 442).

<sup>612</sup> E.g. Nett-ṭ 171,6; 172,13.

<sup>613</sup> CPD (Epil.) takes the (Cūla)Sakkarāja year 926 erroneously as a Sāsana or Mahāsakkarāja date(!). The calculation Nett p. XXXV note “1575 A. D.” is as wrong as the one mentioned JPTS 1910: 121. The exact time given is sunrise on the 9th day of the bright *pakkha* of Sāvana in CS 926/BE 2107.

<sup>614</sup> An unusual epitheton of the king is *siraṭṭhimālapālo*, Nett-ṭ 1,15\*(?).

<sup>615</sup> Bode 1909: 43.

## VIII. Anthologies

383. The oldest collections of texts assembled for practical purposes are Khp, Parit (§ 86sq.) and the undated Suttas, which enjoys a paracanonical status (§ 157).

Anthologies of this type became very popular in mediaeval times and their study seems to have superseded the study of canonical texts to a large extent. The quotations collected in these anthologies deserve the attention of research as useful indicators for the importance and appreciation of certain texts.

**Sārasaṅgaha (Ss: 2.9.3):** Edition: G.H.Sasaki. London 1992<sup>616</sup>.

384. The “Collection of the Essence<sup>617</sup>” is an encyclopaedic handbook for the use of monks. It comprises 40 °[*kathā*]saṅgahanayas, which are summed up in the beginning in a *mātikā*, Ss 1,6–32, which forms a table of contents. Each chapter begins with a few introductory lines similar to an entry in a dictionary followed by a quotation from either canonical text or commentary, e.g. no. 24 *dānādīpuñṇakammasaṅgahanaya*, Ss 176,2–190,33 starts with quotations from Vin V 129,32–34 with Sp 1335,7–12 followed by MN, Ap etc. The texts are named<sup>618</sup> and the method of collecting them is described (Ss 126,5–7).

385. A date of Ss after AD 1200 can be inferred by quotations from Sp-ṭ and Abhidh-s-mhṭ<sup>619</sup>. If Buddhapiya (cf. § 403), the teacher of

---

<sup>616</sup> The oldest manuscript (16th/17th century) in the possession of Vat Viang (Thön/ North Thailand) and filmed by the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University almost necessarily escaped the attention of the editor.

<sup>617</sup> The text is also called *Sāratthasaṅgaha*: Cœdès 1915: 40, Supaphan 1990: 258.

<sup>618</sup> Cf. *ṭhānaniyama*, Ss 26,31–38 “quotation, reference”. The quotations are listed in Yoshimoto 1995.

<sup>619</sup> Ss 224,29–225,21 = Sp-ṭ III 262,3–20; Ss 105,15–18 = Abhidh-s-mhṭ 201,19sq.

Siddhattha (Ss 344,18)<sup>620</sup>, the redactor of Ss, is identical with the grammarian<sup>621</sup>, Ss is to be dated into the 13th/14th century. Ss was used by Vimalakīrti as a source for his Saddharmaratnākara written in AD 1415<sup>622</sup>.

**386.** There are also handbooks addressing Buddhist laypeople:

**Upāsakajanālaṅkāra (Upās: 2.9.41):** Edition: H.Saddhātissa. London 1965.

The “Ornament of Laypeople” was composed to supersede the earlier [Paṭipattisaṅgaha (Paṭip-s: 2.9.43)] (Upās 123,18\*), which still exists, but only in manuscript form<sup>623</sup>, and is quoted occasionally in Upās<sup>624</sup>.

The time and the identity of the author Ānanda, who is mentioned in the colophon, and who lived in South India according to the *nigamaṇa*, are difficult to determine. In the introduction to Upās it is argued that he may have written Upās between AD 1150 and 1200<sup>625</sup>: He quotes Sp-ṭ (Upās 224,19), and Upās may have been used already in the Sinhalese Dharmapradīpikā<sup>626</sup>.

This handbook for *upāsakas* is perhaps a response to numerous works of this kind popular among the Jainas<sup>627</sup>, which were certainly known to Theravādins in South India. However, it may also continue the Theravāda tradition of teaching laypeople beginning with the “Gihivinaya” (§ 62).

**387.** Upās begins with a Nidānakathā missing in Paṭip-s, as Ānanda critically remarks (Upās 123,17\*). In this Pariccheda I the *saraṇagama-*

<sup>620</sup> According to a manuscript consulted by Supaphan 1990: 258 the name of the redactor is Nandācariya.

<sup>621</sup> Norman 1983: 164; cf. § 403.

<sup>622</sup> Godakumbura 1955: 96; Ss is mentioned among the sources of the Thai Traibhūmi-kathā: § 396.

<sup>623</sup> Upās p. 49; cf. Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts Kept in the Otani University Library. Kyoto 1995: 325–330.

<sup>624</sup> Listed Upās p. 119. This list of quotations can be used only with great caution, as no distinction is made between primary and secondary quotations. Of course Vim is quoted only from Vism, and neither Mahāvastu nor Avadānaśataka or Ap-a are quoted, as claimed in this list.

<sup>625</sup> Upās p. 36.

<sup>626</sup> Composed “in the later part of the 12th century”: Godakumbura 1955: 50.

<sup>627</sup> Cf. Norman 1983: 170.

*nas* are dealt with. The following Paricchedas II–IX comment on different parts of a brief text (Upās 174,2–7) treating *sīla*, *ājīva* etc. The material used in Upās was drawn from the Tipiṭaka and from exegetical literature.

388. The following anthologies and cosmological texts were composed in ancient Siam and, as far as their provenience is known, mostly in the Lān<sup>2</sup> Nā kingdoms in the north.

**Maṅgalatthadīpanī ([Maṅg-d]: 2.9.10):** Edition: C° 1927; S° I (1972), II (1974).

389. The “Illustrator of the Meaning of the Maṅgala(suttanta)” was written by Sirimaṅgala in AD 1524 (CS 886), after he had retired to an “empty house” (*suññāgāra*) south of Chiang Mai<sup>628</sup>.

Maṅg-d is conceived as a commentary on the eleven verses of the Maṅgalasuttanta Khp no. 5 = Sn 258–269 (§ 86) interrupted by numerous *kathās* such as the Mātāpituupatṭhānakathā (Maṅg-d I (S°) 267,12–344,14), because the word *mātāpituupatṭhāna* occurs in the fourth (fifth) verse<sup>629</sup>.

The text was widely used in Siam, though no manuscript in northern Thai script seems to survive.

390. Four years earlier in AD 1520 Sirimaṅgala had composed Cak-kav-d (§ 400) and the commentary on Nāṇavilāsa’s *Saṅkhyāpakāsaka* ([Saṅkh-p]: 2.9.20), the *Saṅkhyāpakāsaka-ṭīkā* ([Saṅkh-p-ṭ]: 2.9.20,1), a book on measures and weights<sup>630</sup> while staying southwest to the Sīhalārāma, the present Vat Phra Singh, in the Svan Khvan monastery in Chiang Mai. Saṅkh-p exists in manuscript form<sup>631</sup>.

The earliest known work of Sirimaṅgala is a lengthy commentary on the Vessantara-ja, the *Vessantaradīpanī* ([Vess-dīp: 2.5.10,13, cf. CPD (EpiI:) 87\* s.v. Siri-Maṅgala]) composed in the same monastery in AD 1517 (Supaphan 1986: 382–404).

<sup>628</sup> Cœdès 1915: 40, where the colophon is reproduced.

<sup>629</sup> Maṅg-d does not count the first verse of the Maṅgalasutta.

<sup>630</sup> Supaphan 1990: 326.

<sup>631</sup> Cœdès 1915: 39. The Svan Khan monastery still exists and has been visited by the author together with H.Penth, Chiang Mai, on 3rd August 1995. Recently a new monastery named Tam Nak Sirimaṅgalācāryārāma has been built within the ruins of the enclosure. One of the two (?) old gates of the 15th/16th century is still standing.

391. A different type of anthology is represented by two texts describing the life of the Buddha: The **Paṭhamasambodhi** ([**Paṭham**]: 2.9.11<sup>1</sup>)<sup>632</sup> exists in two versions<sup>633</sup>: The older anonymous one is difficult to date. A *terminus ante quem* is given by the oldest fragmentary manuscripts copied in AD 1574 and 1592 respectively<sup>634</sup>. This seems to rule out the second date Cœdès gives who is inclined to think of the 14th or 16th century<sup>635</sup>. This version contains 9 Paricchēdas, begins with the Bodhisatta's life in the Tusita heaven and ends with the Dhammacakkapavattana.

The contents of the expanded Paṭham composed by Suvannaramsi in 1845 on the basis of older versions of this life of the Buddha, beginning with the marriage of the Bodhisatta's parents and ending with the disappearance of the Dhamma told in 29 Paricchēdas, has been described by Cœdès, who also traced the history of the text<sup>636</sup>.

Both versions are largely based on older material and contain little that is original<sup>637</sup>. Neither version seems to be known outside Southeast Asia.

392. Neither date nor author are known of a second life of the Buddha:

[**Jinamahānidāna** (**Jina-m**: 2.9.112)]: Edition: S° I, II 1987 [vol. II contains a Thai trsl.].

The "Great Story of the Jina" divided into 85 *kathās* begins at the time of the Buddha Dīpaṅkara and ends with the distribution of the relics. In the same way as Paṭham it was built from earlier material and was composed perhaps in the Ayuthaya period (14th to 18th century) according to a guess of the editors<sup>638</sup>.

On the other hand Supaphan 1990: 179–181 discusses the interesting, but unclear remark at the end of one of the manuscripts: *mulak-*

<sup>632</sup> S° 1994. A transcript of a Bangkok manuscript of the 19th century version prepared for S. Lévi in 1925 is preserved in the Institut de Civilisation Indienne and in the library of the Siam Society, Bangkok.

<sup>633</sup> Cœdès 1968 and Supaphan 1990: 156–172.

<sup>634</sup> Both are preserved at Vat Lai Hin.

<sup>635</sup> Cœdès 1968: 226.

<sup>636</sup> Cœdès 1968: 218–223.

<sup>637</sup> The Siamese version of Paṭham has been translated into English by H. Alabaster (Savetsila) 1871: 77–162. The Pāli text has been reissued as a cremation book 1994.

<sup>638</sup> Jina-m has been described by Skilling 1990: 115–118, cf. Supaphan 1990: 178–190.

*kharā malānabhāsāssā pana likkhitā* (!). After checking further rare occurrences of the place name *malāna* she concludes that it perhaps refers Lān<sup>2</sup> Nā. If so, Jina-m might have been composed in the north, which, however, is far from certain.

The relation between Jina-m and Paṭham still awaits investigation.

## IX. Cosmological Texts

393. Two closely connected texts belonging to the Burmese Pāli tradition describe the different forms of existences possible in the circle of rebirth:

**Pañcagatidīpanī ([Pañca-g]: 2.6.12):** Edition: L.Feer: JPTS 1884: 152–161; translation: A.A. Hazlewood, JPTS 11.1987: 133–159 [rev.: J.W.de Jong, IJ 33. 1990, 235sq.].

The “Illustration of the Five Realms of Existence”, divided into five sections (*kaṇḍa*) and containing 114 verses, is indeed a secondary version by an unknown author derived from<sup>639</sup>:

**Chagatidīpanī ([Cha-g]: 2.9.13):** unedited.

394. The equally anonymous “Illustration of the Six Realms of Existence” is accompanied by a voluminous commentary ([**Cha-g-ṭ**]: 2.9.13,1)<sup>640</sup>, which attributes Cha-g to Āśvaghoṣa (Assaghosa etc.)<sup>641</sup> and states that it was translated from Skt. The date of this translation is unknown. At any rate Cha-g-ṭ is later than Loka-p (§ 395)<sup>642</sup>, perhaps compiled during the 11th/12th century, also from Skt. sources. This might well be the approximate date for Cha-g as well. Loka-p and Cha-g are mentioned for the first time as no. 114 and no.118 respectively in the Pagan inscription of AD 1442 (cf. § 396, 445)<sup>643</sup>.

The model of Pañca-g and Cha-g, the Skt. *Ṣaḍgatikārikā*, was also translated into Chinese at the beginning of the 11th century<sup>644</sup>.

---

<sup>639</sup> This has been discovered by and is discussed in Mus 1939: 18–32.

<sup>640</sup> A summary of this commentary is given Loka-p II 303–307, cf. § 395.

<sup>641</sup> Cf. Loka-p I, p. IV following Mus 1939: 185 note.

<sup>642</sup> Loka-p I, p. XLI.

<sup>643</sup> Bode 1909:104, cf. Luce/Tin Htway 1976: 231.

<sup>644</sup> Mus 1939:3.



395. The Loka-p composed in ancient Siam is connected to Cha-g by a long paragraph shared with Cha-g-t, but absent from the Skt. Lokaprajñapti, on which Loka-p is otherwise based<sup>645</sup>:

**Lokapaññatti (Loka-p: 2.9.14):** Edition and translation: E.Denis: *La Lokapaññatti et les Idées Cosmologiques du Bouddhisme Ancien*. I, II. Lille/ Paris 1977; S° 1985 [with Thai trsl.]<sup>646</sup>.

The sources of the “Description of the World” comprise, besides the Skt. Lokaprajñapti, texts such as Mahāvastu or Divyāvadāna<sup>647</sup>. The text written mostly in prose begins like a Suttanta and does not contain a *nigamana*. A large variety of subjects is treated in 16 chapters (*kaṇḍa*). Besides the description of the different parts of the worlds of man and gods, earthquakes or other calamities the legends of Aśoka<sup>648</sup> and Upagupta<sup>649</sup> were included in Lok-p.

396. The first safe date of Loka-p is AD 1442 (§ 394). This text is perhaps mentioned earlier as one of the sources of the Thai Traibhūmi-kathā<sup>650</sup> supposed to have been composed by the later king Li Thai in AD 1345<sup>651</sup>. Further, a Môn inscription from Pagan dated AD 1113 seems to indicate the existence of Loka-p, if not the knowledge of its sources.

Loka-p is well known in Burma and in northern Thailand, but it cannot be traced in Ceylon<sup>652</sup>.

**Loka(ppa)dīpakasāra (Loka-d: 2.9.17<sup>1</sup>):** Edition: S° 1985 [with Thai trsl.]<sup>653</sup>.

397. The “Summary Illustrating the (Different) Worlds” was composed by Medhamkara, who according to the colophon lived in the

<sup>645</sup> Loka-p I, p. II: The *saṃsāragativibhāga*, Loka-p I 116,19–177,11.

<sup>646</sup> Cf. Skilling 1990:119sq.

<sup>647</sup> Following the study by Denis, Loka-p I, p. XI sq. - It should be noted that the verses Loka-p I 92,7\*-16\*, traced back to Mvu I 9,8\*-16\* (Loka-p I p. XLI with p. XXX), are rather taken from Ja V 266,13\*-18\*; on the Lokaprajñapti cf. Dietz 1989 a,b.

<sup>648</sup> Cf. Denis 1976.

<sup>649</sup> Cf. Strong 1991: 186–208.

<sup>650</sup> Reynolds 1982: 350.

<sup>651</sup> This has been disputed by Vickery 1991: 33, who argues for a date “after 1778”.

<sup>652</sup> Loka-p I, p. III.

<sup>653</sup> Cf. Skilling 1990: 120.

“Great Golden Monastery with a Tin Roof” built by an anonymous queen mother in Muttama (Martaban), went to Ceylon to join the Araññavāsins there, and later was the Saṃgharāja and Rājaguru to King Li Thai (Lidaya) in Sukhotai. As this king ruled roughly from 1347 to 1361, when he finally became a monk, Lok-d can be dated rather confidently within this period.

If the early date for the Traibhūmikathā is correct (§ 396), Loka-d could be the Pāli counterpart to this Thai text as conjectured in the introduction to S<sup>e</sup>.

**398.** The text describes in eight Paricchadas the different realms of existence, mostly in verses. Loka-d is quite independent of Loka-p in structure and contents, but also treats topics not found in the earlier cosmology.

The 7th Pariccheda named Okāsalokaniddesa, dealing with the beginning and the destruction of the world and explaining measures and weights may give a hint at the possible contents of the lost (?) **Okāsadīpanī** ([Okāsa-d]: 2.9.15).

**399.** S<sup>e</sup> of Loka-d is based only on manuscripts in Khmer script dating from AD 1781 onwards. There are, however, two older manuscripts in northern Thai script, one dated AD 1581<sup>654</sup>, while the other, earlier and undated one was copied at the beginning of that century<sup>655</sup>.

**Cakkavāḷa(ttha)dīpanī** ([Cakkav-d]: [2.9.172]): Edition: S<sup>e</sup> 1980 [with Thai trsl.]<sup>656</sup>.

**400.** The “Illustration of the World Systems” was composed in 1520 by Sirimaṅgala according to the colophon, which corresponds to the one found in Saṅkh-p-ṭ written in the same year (§ 390).

Cakkav-d is divided into six Kaṇḍas and subdivided into numerous Kathās. It consists mostly of quotations from the Tipiṭaka and its (sub-)commentaries, but also from Abhidh-s-mhṭ etc., which have been traced in the Thai translation.

S<sup>e</sup> lists 17 manuscripts used for the edition without further description. There is a fragmentary northern Thai manuscript pre-

<sup>654</sup> Hundius 1990: 113.

<sup>655</sup> JSS 75.1987: 25–27, where the colophon by Medhamkara is communicated.

<sup>656</sup> Cf. Skilling 1990: 118sq.

served in Vat Phra Singh, Chiang Mai, copied in CS 900 : AD 1538, less than twenty years after the text had been composed and possibly still during the life time of the author, which appears to be unique in the Pāli tradition. The cover folio gives Cakkavāḷatthadīpanī as the title.

401. Lastly, the following astrological text may be mentioned here:

**Candasuriyagatidīpanī ([Candas-dj: 2.9.19): unedited.**

Candas-d survives only (?) in a transcript prepared by U Bokay in Pagan in 1981. The original manuscript dated AD 1775 was found by him in the delapidated Gaing-ok Kyaung monastery in Pagan, which has disappeared in the meantime<sup>657</sup>.

Only the first part occasionally quotes from commentaries to the Tipiṭaka and Vism-mhṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ. The 5th and longest chapter, the Ayanavinicchaya, is a *jyotiṣa*-text perhaps based on some Skt. original.

402. The introductory verses mention the title “Illustration of the Movements of Sun and Moon” and the teacher of the author, the Mahāthera Udumbara. The colophon gives Candasuriyavinicchayaparakaraṇa as an alternative title and Uttamaṅga as the unusual name of the author, who had been the teacher (*ācariya*) of two “famous kings” in the country called Tambara (or: Tammarā<sup>658</sup>), and who calls himself “proficient in the three Vedas”, but at the same time Tipiṭakamahāthera. Consequently, he may have been a Brahmin well versed in Skt. astrology who had been converted to Buddhism (?).

The text was composed in Burma because it is said: “this is unknown here in Marammadesa (Burma) to all astrologers, for they are ignorant of the movements of the planets (?*cakkanakkhatta*)”.

No other hint concerning the time of composition of this unusual Pāli text is available except for the date of the manuscript.

<sup>657</sup> A copy of the transcript provided through the kindness of Dr. W. Sailer, Bangkok, is in the possession of the author. The information given here is based on a brief introduction to his transcript by U Bokay.

<sup>658</sup> Alternative interpretations of the manuscript by U Bokay; cf. Tamba § 348?

## X. Poetry

403. A number of short metrical texts has been composed in Ceylon under obvious Skt. influence<sup>659</sup>:

**Pajjamadhu (Pajj: 4.5.4):** Edition: E.R.Goonaratne, JPTS 1887: 1–16.

The “Sweet Verses” praise the Buddha, his community and the Nibbāna in 102 Vasantatilaka verses to which two further verses were appended, the first giving the name of the author and the title of the work, and the second a benediction in Śardūlavikrīḍita metre.

The author is Buddhapiya, a pupil of Ānanda Araññaratana (Pajj 103, cf. § 413)<sup>660</sup>. Consequently the 13th century is a likely date for Pajj<sup>661</sup>.

**Telakaṭṭhagāthā (Tel: 4.5.5):** Edition: E.R.Goonaratne, JPTS 1884: 49–68.

404. The 98 “Verses Spoken in a Pot with (Boiling) Oil” in Vasantatilaka metre describe the Buddhist teachings in nine brief chapters. There does not seem to be any immediate reference in Tel to the occasion at which these verses are supposed to have been spoken. The relevant incident is told in different versions, namely that a wrongly accused Thera is either thrown into the sea (Mhv XXII 13–20) or boiled in oil (Ras 249,10–250,2).

405. Neither the author nor the title of the poem or the date are mentioned in the text, and it is assumed that Tel is older than Ras (§ 413)<sup>662</sup>. The first reference to Tel is found in the Noen Sara Bua

---

<sup>659</sup> On Skt. literature in Ceylon: Bechert 1985: 244[6]–246[8] for bibliographical reference and Bechert 1987b.

<sup>660</sup> This Buddhapiya is probably not identical with the grammarian (§ 385): Ras (ed. Matsumura), p. XXIX sq.

<sup>661</sup> Upās p. 35 and § 343 note 555, cf. further Das 1989/1990.

<sup>662</sup> Norman 1983: 156.

(Prachinburi/Thailand) inscription by Buddhasiri dated 683 Śaka or AD 761, where Tel 2–4 are quoted<sup>663</sup>.

**Jinacarita (Jina-c: 4.5.6):** Editions: H.W.D.Rouse, JPTS 1904/05: 1–65; with translation: Ch.Duroiselle: Jinacarita or “The Career of the Conqueror”. Rangoon 1906 (repr. Delhi 1982).

**406.** The career of the Buddha beginning with the time of Dīpaṃkara is described in a highly ornate style in 449 verses in different metres, to which 15 verses giving the wishes of the author for his future lives are added. The author names himself as the Thera Medhaṃkara living in a monastery erected by King Vijayabāhu (Jinac 469–471), and calls himself a pupil of Sumaṅgala of the Jambuddoṇi monastery in the colophon to the Payogasiddhi. Thus this Sumaṅgala is hardly identical with Sumaṅgala of the Nandipariveṇa, who was the teacher of the subcommentator Sāriputta (§ 343). Consequently it is difficult to tell whether it is correct to prefer Vijayabāhu II. (1186–1187) as the founder of the monastery with Duroiselle, Jinac p. III or Vijayabāhu III. (1232–1236) with Malalasekera 1928: 230. In both cases Medhaṃkara may have lived in the 13th century as generally assumed<sup>664</sup>.

**407.** A text of similar contents is:

**Jinālāmkāra (Jināl: 4.5.13):** Editions: J.Gray, London 1894 [with trsl., repr. 1981]; C° 1900.

Although there is some confusion about the name of the author in Buddhist tradition<sup>665</sup>, the colophon verses to the **Jinālāmkāravapṇanā (Jināl-pt: 4.5.13,1)** clarify that both text and commentary were composed in AD 1156 by the Thera Buddharakkhita born in Rohaṇa (Ceylon)<sup>666</sup>.

<sup>663</sup> I am obliged to M.Wright, Bangkok, who drew my attention to this discovery by Rohanadeera 1988: 51–56. The inscription has been published in: Cārūk nai praḥ-  
des daly. vol. I. Bangkok 1986: 179–186. The exact date is not beyond doubt, but  
the century seems to be fairly certain. – The meaning of the title is discussed by  
Dhadphale 1978.

<sup>664</sup> Norman 1983: 164.

<sup>665</sup> Norman 1983: 159.

<sup>666</sup> The colophon is found in Godakumbura 1980: 52 and is quoted in Jinak 71,19\*-  
24\*.

The “Embellishments of Buddha” tells the story of the Buddha in different complicated metres and applies all sorts of *Alaṃkāras* to the 241 verses beginning with the vow to become a Buddha made in the presence of *Dīpaṃkara* and ending with the *Nibbāna*. The last and 30th chapter contains the wish of the author in nine *Triṣṭubh* verses to be reborn when *Metteyya* will appear and then to aspire to *Buddhahood*.

*Jināl C°* 1900 contains a slightly longer version with altogether twenty additional verses inserted at different places, and gives the colophon verses otherwise found in *Jināl-pṭ* as part of *Jināl* (verses 271–278).

**Sādhucaritodaya (Sādhū-c: 4.5.9):** Edition: *C°* Uparatanathera 1915.

**408.** The “Stories on Good Conduct” (*Godakumbura*) were composed by an otherwise unknown *Sumedha* at the request of a *sabhādhīpati* *Gajabhuja* probably during the 12th century. The poem consists of 1432 verses in different metres, which relate meritorious deeds by people of the past. The stories are mostly drawn from the *Apadāna*. This hardly known text has been described by *Godakumbura* 1950.

**[Jinabodhāvalī (Jina-b: 5.5.14)]:** Edition and Translation: *J. Liyanaratne*, BEFEO 72. 1983: 49–80.

**408a.** The “Line of the Jinas and Their Bodhi-Trees” (*Liyanaratne*), which is also called *Abhinīhāradīpanī* “Explanation of the Resolve (to Become a Buddha)”, was composed by *Devarakkhita Jayabāhu Dhammakitti* in Ceylon by the middle of the 14th century. It praises the 28 Buddhas and their bodhi-trees in 34 verses. The rich introduction to this brief text by *Liyanaratne* contains a detailed discussion on the author and his work.

## XI. Collections of Stories

[**Dasa(dāna)vatthuppakaraṇa (Dasav: 4.1.13)**]: Edition and translation: J.Ver Eecke. Paris 1976. PEFE0 108<sup>667</sup>.

409. The “Book (Illustrating) the Ten Types of Gifts” begins with verses about the ten objects suitable to be presented to the Saṃgha such as food, cloth, housing etc. and continues with 37 stories (*vatthus*) named after the respective central figure. The stories were compiled by an anonymous author from various commentaries and Mhv<sup>668</sup>, with the exception of no. 12 Asandhimittā-vatthu (Dasav 45–54) which is related to the Aśoka legend more popular in SE Asia than in Ceylon<sup>669</sup>. This could indicate a SE Asian origin of Dasav<sup>670</sup>.

As the merit gained by gifts to the Saṃgha is explained, Dasav comes close to an *ānisaṃsa* “praise of the results of meritorious deeds” (Dasav p. IX)<sup>671</sup>.

The lower limit for the date of Dasav is the Pagan inscription of AD 1442, where it is mentioned as no. 120 Dasavatthu<sup>672</sup>, the upper ones are the commentaries by Dhammapāla (§ 365). There does not seem to be any method at present to narrow this interval of about eight hundred years between AD 600 and 1400.

[**Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa (Sah: 4.1.12)**]: Edition: C<sup>e</sup> A.P.Buddhadatta Colombo 1959; E<sup>e</sup>: S.Gandhi, Delhi 1991<sup>673</sup>.

---

<sup>667</sup> A fragmentary manuscript copied at the beginning of the 16th century is preserved at Vat Lai Hin.

<sup>668</sup> On parallels to no. 1 Anuruddha-vatthu (Dasav 3sq.): Bechert 1961: 153sq.

<sup>669</sup> Dasav p. IX corresponds to ExtMhv V 340–400; cf. Norman 1983: 140, 153.

<sup>670</sup> The metrical Dasav mentioned in Saddhātissa 1981: 185 seems to be a different text.

<sup>671</sup> On *ānisaṃsa* cf. Cœdès 1966: 49a; Finot 1917: 72. Further *ānisaṃsa*-texts are, e.g.: *Paṃsukūladānānisaṃsakathā* and *Piṭakattayakāraṇānisaṃsa*, Martini 1972; *Paṃsukūlānisaṃsa*, Martini 1973.

<sup>672</sup> Bode 1909: 104, cf. Luce/Tin Htway 1976: 231.

<sup>673</sup> E<sup>e</sup> appears to be an (unusually careless) transcript of C<sup>e</sup>.

410. Although Sah was handed down as an anonymous text, J. Matsumura has succeeded recently in identifying Raṭṭhapāla of the [Taṃ]Guttavaṅka<sup>674</sup> monastery, mentioned in the introduction to Ras (§ 413), as the author, who is criticized by Vedeḥa in his introduction to Ras (§ 413) for having created a rather confused text<sup>675</sup>.

The introductory verses state that Sah will follow the method of the Sinhalese commentaries (*Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathānaya*), which, however, do not seem to have been the immediate model, unless this refers to the [Sahassavattuḷḷhakathā (Sah-a: 4.1.12,1)].

The latter text is quoted three times in Mahv-ṭ. A comparison with Sah shows that the relevant paragraphs in Mahv-ṭ and Sah are not identical<sup>676</sup>. Moreover, Mhv-ṭ 607,8 refers to Sah-a for a certain detail in the Sāliṛājakumāra-vatthu, Sah VI 2 (E<sup>c</sup> 78,23–26). Sah, however, omits this story altogether, referring the reader back to Mhv (*Mahāvamse vuttanayena veditabbam*), which might mean Mhv-ṭ 605,1–608,8, where the romantic story of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's son Sāli is told in great detail (cf. § 413)<sup>677</sup>, or the lost Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathāmahāvamsa, the predecessor to Mahānāma's work, if Matsumura's very attractive assumption is correct<sup>678</sup>.

411. Consequently Sah-a and Sah are two different texts, the former being older and the latter probably younger than Mhv-ṭ. Thus it is not unlikely that Sah is simply a more recent and incomplete version of Sah-a, which appears to have contained ten chapters (*vagga*) with at least ten Vatthus each, as still mirrored in Sah<sup>679</sup>.

The text division and the numbering of the Vatthus found in the manuscript tradition of Sah is irregular in two instances: Vagga V comprises only five Vatthus and Sah VI 4 is missing indicating a gap<sup>680</sup>.

<sup>674</sup> The correct form of the name is Guttavaṅka as shown in Ras (ed. Matsumura), p. XXXV note 3.

<sup>675</sup> T. Rahula 1984: 172 draws attention to the bad Pāli of Raṭṭhapāla as being sometimes heavily influenced by Sinhalese usage.

<sup>676</sup> Mhv-ṭ 451,9–19 ≠ Sah V 2 (E<sup>c</sup> 66,26sq.); Mhv-ṭ 452,25 ≠ Sah V 4 (E<sup>c</sup> 68,31).

<sup>677</sup> Mhv XXXIII 2 only briefly mentions this story: Geiger 1905: 39, cf. Rahula 1944: 87 = 1966: XXXII. The SE Asian ExtMhv does not dwell upon this event in Sinhalese history.

<sup>678</sup> Matsumura 1992: 476.

<sup>679</sup> Vagga VIII contains 11 stories in Sah, cf. the end of story no. 75.

<sup>680</sup> The numbering as found in E<sup>c</sup> is confirmed by the manuscript described in Somadasa 1987: 305.



412. As rightly pointed out by Rahula<sup>681</sup>, the structure of Vagga IV differs from the rest of Sah, as only here the stories are introduced by verses. Therefore, it is possible that the 15 Vatthus in Vaggas IV and V were originally adopted from a source different from the one of the rest. It is, however, impossible to tell whether or not these stories were found already in Sah-a<sup>682</sup>.

Although Sah is called “Thousand Stories” there are only 101 Vatthus<sup>683</sup>.

As Sah seems to be younger than Mhv-ṭ, it should have been composed after AD 900, and before AD 1250, because Ras (§ 413) composed in the late 13th century is based on Sah. Together with Dasav (§ 409) Sah is also mentioned in the Pagan inscription of AD 1442.

(Madhu)Rasavāhinī (Ras: 4.1.10): Edition: C<sup>e</sup> 1899–1901; E<sup>e</sup>: M. und W. Geiger: Die zweite Dekade der Rasavāhinī. München 1918; S. Gandhi, Delhi 1988<sup>684</sup>; J. Matsumura: The Rasavāhinī of Vedeḥa Thera, Vaggas V and VI. Osaka 1992.

Commentary: [Rasavāhinīṭkā (Ras-ṭ: 4.1.10,1)]: Editions: C<sup>e</sup> 1907; E<sup>e</sup> (on Ras V and VI): Ras (ed. Matsumura), Appendix I.

413. Ras, also called Madhurasavāhinī in manuscripts mostly in SE Asia<sup>685</sup>, “Stream of (Sweet) Sentiments”, has been composed by Vedeḥa a pupil of Ānanda Araññaratana (cf. § 403) in the 13th century<sup>686</sup>. In the *nigamana* (verse 8) he names himself as the author of both Ras and Samantak (§ 198)<sup>687</sup>.

<sup>681</sup> Rahula 1944: 89 = 1966: XXXII.

<sup>682</sup> On the structure and inconsistencies of Sah cf. T. Rahula 1984: 171.

<sup>683</sup> The suggestion by Malalasekera quoted in Rahula 1944: 91 = 1966: XXXIV, who wants to derive *sahassa* from Skt. *saharṣa* is not very likely, because Pāli *hassa* < Skt. *hāsyā*, but Skt. *harṣati* > Pāli *hamsati*. “Amusing (if not “Ridiculous”) Stories” would make a queer title.

<sup>684</sup> Cf. note 673 above.

<sup>685</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 226.

<sup>686</sup> Besides Ānanda, Vedeḥa mentions also the Mahātheras Maṅgala and Kālīṅga as his preceptors, cf. Malalasekera 1928: 223; on Vedeḥa: Ras (ed. Matsumura) p. XXVI–XXX, where the colophon is discussed in detail. The colophon to Ras always has Araññāyatana instead of Araññaratana.

<sup>687</sup> Vedeḥa also wrote a Sinhalese grammar called Saddalakkhaṇa, which was thought (probably erroneously) to be identical with the Sidatsaṅgarāva: Ras (ed. Matsumura) p. XXIX.

Ras is not an original work, but as stated in the introductory verses, based upon an earlier collection of stories by Raṭṭhapāla of the [Taṃ]Guttavaṇka monastery. As Matsumura has shown, the text referred to by Vedeḥa is Sah (§ 410)<sup>688</sup>.

**414.** Ras is divided into two parts, the first comprising stories originating from Jambūḍīpa (India) (Ras I–IV: Jambudīpuppattivatthu), the second those from Ceylon (Ras V–X: Sīhaladīpuppattivatthu), and is subdivided into ten chapters (*vagga*) with altogether 103 Vatthus.

**415.** The stories in Ras and Sah, which may be based upon Sah-a, are almost the same, only Sah VI 7 (no. 51) Phussadevattheravatthu is missing in Ras, which again has a few additional Vatthus, among them the full text of the Sāliṛājakumāravatthu (Ras VIII 6), where Mhv XXXIII 1–4 is quoted (Ras E° 347,6\*–21\*, cf. § 409). The arrangement of stories is, however, quite different in both texts<sup>689</sup>.

**[Sīha]avatthuppakaraṇa (Sīh: 4.1.11):** Edition and Translation: J. Ver Eecke. Paris 1980. PEFEO 123.

**416.** The “Collection of Stories from Ceylon” is written in a mixture of prose and verse and comprises five chapters with ten Vatthus each<sup>690</sup>. The last two chapters are almost entirely in verse.

The stories mostly begin with *evam anusuyyate* “thus it has been handed down by tradition” and are based on older material, which still has to be traced in detail. They glorify the merit of donations by reminding the readers or hearers of examples from the past.

**417.** At the end of Sīh no. 50 it is clearly stated that the book has been completed. The following stories, which are numbered in the manuscripts from 1 to 32 contain neither the introduction *evam anusuyyate* nor verses. Thus it is not unlikely that this appendix was originally a collection of its own combined with Sīh, because these stories, too, begin with “in Sīhaladīpa”.

<sup>688</sup> Ras (ed. Matsumura), p. XXXVI–XLI.

<sup>689</sup> T. Rahula 1984: 176sq. and Ras (ed. Matsumura), p. XXXIX–XLI give a concordance of both texts.

<sup>690</sup> On gaps in the text cf. Sīh p. IV sq.

418. According to the colophons following Sīh no. 20 and no. 50 the author's name is Dhammanandi, who is an Ācariya and Thera from the Paṭṭakoṭṭi monastery in Kaṇṭakaselapaṭṭana (?), which may have been located in South India<sup>691</sup>.

There is no hint at the date of Sīh, which is also listed in the Pagan inscription of AD 1442 (§ 445). The latest historical person mentioned in Sīh is King Mahāsena (334–362), which, of course, has hardly any bearing on the date of the text<sup>692</sup>. The character of the edifying tales and the collection as a whole point to a time near to Dasav, Sah or Ras (§ 413).

---

<sup>691</sup> The location of the village is as unknown as the name of the monastery. The correct form of both names cannot be established from the corrupt manuscript tradition: Sīh p. III.

<sup>692</sup> Mori 1987 lists only historical persons mentioned in Sīh without any consequences for the chronology of Sīh itself; cf. also Mori 1988a.

## XII. Pāli Literature from South East Asia

**419.** The Pāli literature composed in Ceylon perhaps beginning with the Parivāra (§ 42) or Dīp (§ 182) and continuing right into our century has been described by Malalasekera 1928<sup>693</sup>.

In Burma the first literary works seem to have been composed much later, from the 11th century onward. Their history has been traced by Bode 1909. Additions on later Pāli texts can be found in Bollée 1968a,b<sup>694</sup>.

For Thailand, where Pāli texts were composed at a still later date, no comparable comprehensive survey is available in spite of the very useful sketch by G.Cœdès (1886–1969) and the researches by Supaphan<sup>695</sup>.

### XII.1 Nīti Texts

**420.** An important addition to the knowledge about Pāli literature from Burma is the first critical edition of

[Dhammanīti (Dhn: 2.10.1); Lokanīti (Ln: 2.10.21); Mahārahanīti (Mhn: 2.10.3); Rājanīti (Rn: 2.10.4)]: Edition: Pāli Nīti Texts from Burma (PNTB) ed. by H.Bechert and H.Braun. London 1981.

---

<sup>693</sup> Even later than Malalasekera 1928 Nāṇāloka composed his [Pārupanapāli nāma Parimaṇḍala-Supaṭicchannasikkhāpadavaṇṇanā (Pārup: 1.4.4)]: Edition: C<sup>e</sup> Colombo 1934: This “Text on the (Proper) Dress” comments on Sekkhiya I, II (Vin IV 185,18\*\*;186,8\*\*) and deals with the *ekamsaka*-controversy: v.Hinüber 1995a: 39.

<sup>694</sup> A specimen of Jāgara’s Vinaya commentary written in AD 1869: [Pācityādiyojanā (Pāc-y: 1.2.14,1)]: Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1972 is found in v.Hinüber 1987: 125–127.

<sup>695</sup> Cœdès 1915; Supaphan 1990: cf. also Saddhātissa 1974–1981, which is indexed by Filliozat 1992. In spite of the title, Saddhātissa 1976 deals with editions of the Tipiṭaka during the early Ratanakosin period (18th–20th century), cf. Kongkeo 1982; Saddhātissa 1979 contains slightly updated informations from Finot 1917.

Date and author of Dhn (414 verses), Ln (167 verses), and Mhn (254 verses) are uncertain, while in Rn (134 verses) the brahmins Anantañāṇa and Gaṇāmiṣṣa are named as the compilers (Rn 134). The latter is mentioned in an inscription of the 16th century thus providing a date for this compilation<sup>696</sup>.

421. All four collections rely heavily on Indian Subhāṣita traditions<sup>697</sup> and add verses from Pāli sources, particularly in Dhn. Some verses, especially in Rn, are often direct translations from Sanskrit<sup>698</sup>, which accounts for an at times rather Sanskritized Pāli<sup>699</sup>.

The history of the compilations has been traced in the careful and comprehensive study by Bechert and Braun in the introduction to PNTB, where also further Nīti collections have been described<sup>700</sup>.

422. A second Pāli text called Lokanīti (Ln: 2.10.22) is extant in Thailand and popular particularly in the north. The content is quite different from Ln<sup>701</sup>.

423. Further, the following Nīti text is found in northern Thailand:

[Lokaneyyappakaraṇa (Loka-n: 2.10.5)]: Edition: P.S.Jaini. London 1986.

The “Book on the Instruction in World(ly Matters)” was edited on the basis of a single recent manuscript in Khmer script. There is, however, a manuscript in northern Thai script copied in AD 1726<sup>702</sup> giving the title as Lokaneyya(ppakaraṇanavakaṇḍapāli).

The text contains 41 didactic stories with verses<sup>703</sup> in the style of the Skt. Pañcatantra or Hitopadeśa. They are based on and shaped like Jātakas, but also draw material from apocryphal Suttantas<sup>704</sup>.

<sup>696</sup> PNTB § 32; Dhn: PNTB § 21 (after 1367, before 1500); Ln: PNTB § 15 (14th century ??); Mhn: PNTB § 26 (15th century?).

<sup>697</sup> Sternbach 1974.

<sup>698</sup> PNTB § 47–54.

<sup>699</sup> PNTB § 55–58.

<sup>700</sup> Cf. Bechert 1991a.

<sup>701</sup> PNTB § 8, 13.

<sup>702</sup> Preserved in Vat Lai Hin.

<sup>703</sup> Some verses have been translated in Jaini 1984.

<sup>704</sup> Of course the author did not have any access to an otherwise unknown Aṭṭhakathā as suggested Loka-n p. XLV, cf. § 435.

The date of Loka-n is difficult to determine. Some cross references to compilations of Nīti verses may point to the 14th century<sup>705</sup>.

424. The manuscript mentioned in the preceding paragraph contains a second text:

[Manussavineyya (Manus: 2.10.6)]: Unedited.

This short “Instruction for Man”, comprising only eight folios, begins like an apocryphal Suttanta. Its exact content is not yet known. However, the quotation from a Manussavinayavaṇṇanā in a letter sent from Siam to Ceylon in AD 1756 (§ 443) is very similar to a paragraph in Manus<sup>706</sup>.

## XII.2 Chronicles from Thailand

425. In contrast to the old verse chronicles composed in Ceylon (§ 182sq.) those written in Thailand consist of prose with inserted passages in verses. This style is preserved also in the late Sgv (§ 199). Moreover, histories of famous Buddha images are typical for the Siamese religious historical literature.

[Cāmadevīvaṃsa (Cdv: 4.2.7)]: Edition: S<sup>e</sup> 1920; Cœdès 1925: 141–171 (chapter VII: Kambojaparājaya, E<sup>e</sup> and translation).

426. The “Chronicle of Cāmadevī” was translated from Thai by the Mahāthera Bodhirāṃsi probably in Chiang Mai in the very early 15th century<sup>707</sup>. The main story concerning Queen Cāmadevī, the first ruler of the kingdom of Haripuñjaya (Lamphun) in the ninth century, comprises chapters IV–XI<sup>708</sup> out of a total of 15 chapters (*pariccheda*). The introduction gives a prophecy by the Buddha about relics later to be discovered by King Ādittarāja in the 12th century, which is told at the end of Cdv. Thus this text was composed to trace the origin of the important relics at Lamphun<sup>709</sup>.

<sup>705</sup> Loka-n p. XLVII.

<sup>706</sup> Supaphan 1988: 201=§ 34.

<sup>707</sup> Cœdès 1925: 13, cf. Cœdès 1915: 43sq., cf. Hazra 1986: 32–35.

<sup>708</sup> Table of contents: Cœdès 1925: 14; *pariccheda* V–VI and the end of IV are lost.

<sup>709</sup> Wyatt 1976/1994: 115/12.

**427.** The same Bodhirāṃsi composed in Pāli, or translated from Thai, the history of the Phra Singh Buddha image under the title [*Sihinga-(buddharūpa)-nidāna* (Sbn: 4.2.8)]: S<sup>e</sup> 1913<sup>710</sup>. This and the Pāli texts on Buddha images mentioned below have been printed in almost inaccessible editions in Thailand. Sbn has been translated either from the Thai or from the Pāli original by C. Notton: *P'ra Buddha Sihinga*. Bangkok 1933.

Further, texts of this kind are: *Brahmarājapañña*: [*Ratanabimba-(vaṃsa)vaṇṇanā* (Rb-v: 4.2.9)] (S<sup>e</sup> 1912 with a Thai trsl.) or *Ariyavaṃsa*<sup>711</sup>: [*Amarakaṭṭhabuddharūpanidāna* (Akn: 4.2.10)], both composed in the 15th century and both dependent on the same sources as the corresponding stories in *Jinak* (§ 428). *Ariyavaṃsa* also composed the [*Aḍḍhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna* (Abn: 4.2.11)]<sup>712</sup>.

The study of these histories of images has been neglected outside Thailand. A survey of extant texts and a description of their contents is a desideratum.

**428.** The story of a number of Buddha images has been included in the comprehensive Thai history of Buddhism:

**Jinakālamālī** (*Jinak*: 4.2.1): Edition: A.P. Buddhadatta. London 1962; translation: N.A. Jayawickrama: *The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conquerer*. London 1968; – H. Penth: *Jinakālamālī Index. An Annotated Index to the Thailand Part of Ratanapañña's Chronicle Jinakālamālī*. Oxford/ Chiang Mai 1994.

*Jinak* was composed in AD 1516/1517 and enlarged in AD 1527 by Ratanapañña (ca. 1473–after 1527)<sup>713</sup>, who lived at the then prominent Vat Pā Dāng “Redwood Grove Monastery” near Chiang Mai. The events in the very early history of Buddhism in India and Ceylon are related as an introduction before Ratanapañña concentrates on the history of the Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai areas roughly between AD 1260 and 1527.

<sup>710</sup> Cf. Hazra 1986: 55–57. On a northern Thai manuscript dated AD 1837: Hundius 1990: 128sq.

<sup>711</sup> This *Ariyavaṃsa* seems to be different from his contemporary namesake, the author of *Maṇis*: § 347.

<sup>712</sup> Cœdès 1915: 46; cf. also *Kosalabimbavaṇṇanā* § 271.

<sup>713</sup> *Ratanapañña* is a title rather than a personal name: Penth: 1995.

There seem to be later additions and a gap in the manuscript tradition<sup>714</sup> as all information on the years 1455–1476, including the council held in Chiang Mai in AD 1477/1478 under King Tiloka (1442–1487), is missing.

The narrative is occasionally interrupted by retrospective accounts particularly when stories of famous Buddha images are related (§ 427).

This important source for Buddhism in Thailand was used by the Saṅgītivāṃsa (§ 199).

**429.** An intermediate position between legend and Jātaka is taken up by:

**[Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa (Pbv: 4.2.12)]:** Edition and translation: G. Martini, BEFEO 55.1969: 125–145.

The form of this text is largely that of a Jātaka and as such it forms an appendix to the Paññāsa-ja (§ 270). It contains, however, the legend of the holy place Duṅ Yaṅ in Thailand, which is said to have been visited by the five Buddhas of the present world age (*kappa*). Thus the content is similar to Cdv (§ 426).

### XII.3 Apocryphal Texts from Thailand

**430.** Jātaka stories enjoyed a particular popularity in Thailand, which gave rise to the creation of a large number of apocryphal Ja, partly collected in the Paññāsa-ja (§ 270). A number of Ja exist outside this collection, such as:

**[Sivijayajātaka (Sj-ja: 2.5.10,3)]:** Unedited.

**431.** This text, which is also called Sivijayapañha or Mahāsivijaya-ja, is one of the earliest Pāli texts that became known in the west. ~~Consequently it was used in the first Pāli grammar published in Europe~~<sup>715</sup>.

<sup>714</sup> It is remarkable that no northern Thai manuscript of Jinak survives.

<sup>715</sup> Burnouf/Lassen 1826: 209.



Although the contents of the story is somewhat similar to a Ja, and although the central person is the Bodhisatta as Sivijaya, this is rather a collection of a considerable number of stories than a true Ja, because the frame of a Ja (cf. § 112) is missing.

The date and the exact place of composition are uncertain. The oldest extant manuscript, which at the same time is the oldest known manuscript of an apocryphal Ja, was copied in northern Thailand in AD 1580<sup>716</sup>.

432. Two texts connected to the Jātaka-collection are attributed to an otherwise unknown (Culla-)Buddhaghosa (Gv 63,6sq.): Jātattakānidāna and Sotattakānidāna. Only the latter seems to survive:

[Sotattakā[mahā]nidāna (Smn: 2.5.10,4)]: Edition: B<sup>e</sup> 1928; S<sup>e</sup> 1983 [with an English introduction by W.Sailer and a Thai trsl.].

Smn contains mainly an abbreviated version of the Jātaka-Nidāna (§ 111), in which first of all the verses from Bv embedded in the Nidānakathā are quoted, and only rarely prose passages. Thus Smn is at the same time an abbreviated Bv, in which the individual chapters have been reshaped by adding new verses sometimes based on the prose of the Nidānakathā.

In the beginning some apocryphal Ja were added as an introduction, among them the Siddhatthateladāyikārājaputtivattu, which relates the rebirth of the Bodhisatta as a woman because of his “bad Karman to be experienced in a rebirth after a rebirth” (*aparāpariyavedaniyapāpakamma*, Smn 24,4).

Only rarely information not found elsewhere in Pāli literature, it seems, is given, such as the Bodhi trees of the Buddhas of the past Taṇṇakara, Medhaṇkara and Saramṇakara (Smn 48,8\*-14\*).

After the story of Sumedha and the Buddha Dīpaṇkara has been told, and the contents of Bv III–XXV have been given, appendices based on Bv-a (Vemattakathā: Bv-a 296,1–297,40; Timaṇḍalakathā: Bv-a 298,9–15; Avijahitakathā: Bv-a 297,41–298,6) and different other short appendices follow. At the very end in the Ānandapucchitakathā, the ten future Bodhisattas are enumerated (cf. § 201sq.).

<sup>716</sup> Hundius 1990: 133–144, cf. Supaphan 1990: 120–126, where the interval BE 2000–2300 (AD 1457–1757) given as the assumed date of the composition can be narrowed to AD 1450–1550 (BE 2000–2100) by help of this manuscript.

**433.** The author is named as Buddhaghosa in the *nigamana* (Smn 97,11\*) and the title is given as: ... *pakaraṇaṃ* ... *sotatthakī*, Smn 97,8\*sq. Neither the exact form nor the meaning of Sotthatakī are certain: Gv has Sotattagī(pakaraṇa), Saddh-s IX 34 Sodattabhi(!)nidānaka and the Pagan inscription of AD 1442, no. 95 and Piṭ-sm have Sotattakīnidāna. Here this text is named together with the second work of this “Buddhaghosa”: Jātattakī-Sotattakī-nidāna. This aptly follows an enumeration of canonical Ja-texts<sup>717</sup>.

**434.** It may be concluded from the contents of Smn that [Jātattakīnidāna (Jtn: 2.5.10,5)], which apparently has been lost<sup>718</sup>, was a condensed version of the Ja mainly in verses. The relatively early date of both texts is not only guaranteed by the Pagan inscription, but for Smn also by the earlier Saddh-s (14/15th century?, cf. § 4).

**435.** A further text is also loosely connected to the canonical Ja-collection as a kind of *ānisaṃsa* (§ 409):

[Māleyyattheravatthu (Mth-v: 4.1.14)]: Edition: E.Denis / S.Collins: Braḥ Māleyyadevattheravatthum, JPTS 18.1993: 1–17.

The text tells the story of the Elder Māleyya, who visited heaven and hell to communicate his experiences later to people on earth. In heaven he meets with Metteyya, who emphasizes the merits of listening to the Vessantara-Ja. Consequently Mth-v is often found in manuscripts as an appendix to this Ja.

The relation of Mth-v to other collections such as Sth is discussed in the introduction to the edition.

The date of this text composed in Thailand is uncertain. Two very old, though undated manuscripts were copied in northern Thailand in about AD 1500<sup>719</sup>. Thus it is not unlikely that Mth-v belongs to the 15th century<sup>720</sup>.

**436.** Besides Ja and similar stories there is a number of apocryphal Suttantas (cf. § 195), which have only recently found some attention by research. Many of these texts of evident importance for Theravāda

<sup>717</sup> The reason why the text is called a “Mahā”nidāna in S\* is unclear.

<sup>718</sup> Jtn is not mentioned after Smn, Piṭ-sm no. 346.

<sup>719</sup> They are preserved in the National Archives, Chiang Mai.

<sup>720</sup> Supaphan 1990: 313–325; Norman 1994: 13sq.

as practised in Ceylon or SE Asia exist only in manuscript form. The following have been edited so far<sup>721</sup>:

**[Tuṇḍilovādasutta (Tuṇḍ-s: 2.11.1)]**: Edition: Ch.Hallisey, JPTS 15.1990: 155–195.

**[Nibbānasutta (Nibbāna-s: 2.11.2)]**: Edition: Ch.Hallisey, JPTS 18.1993: 97–130.

**[Ākāravattārasutta (Ākārav-s: 2.11.3)]**: Edition: P.S.Jaini, IJ 35.1992: 193–223.

While the first Suttanta has been edited from Sinhalese manuscripts, the latter two are found in one copy each in Khmer script. Consequently, they seem to be of SE Asian origin.

These texts are shaped like canonical Suttantas. The Tuṇḍilovāda-s “Advice to Tuṇḍila” is a popular exposition of Theravāda centered around the merits of *dāna* “giving”. This text contains a simile comparing Nibbāna to a city, which is the main topic of the Nibbāna-s.

The strange title Ākāravattāra-s has been interpreted by Jaini as “The Sutta which expounds the manner (of averting rebirth in hell)”, which also describes the contents. This text, which wrongly claims to be part of SN, is also called a SN-commentary at the end Ākāravattāra-suttavaṇṇanā, without being a commentary. This practice is not unusual in Pāli manuscripts from Thailand, which occasionally add an apparently meaningless °*vaṇṇanā* to almost any text (cf. v.Hinüber 1993: 225).

437. Not the slightest hint at the date of these texts is available at present. However, the phenomenon as such, that is Suttantas existing outside the canon, seems to be very old (cf. § 98). Even if the texts themselves do not survive, titles of apocryphal Suttantas, which were not included in the canon during the first three councils (*tisso saṃgītiyo anārūḥe*, Sp 742,24), are known:

**Kulumba-s; Rājovāda-s; Tikkhindriya; Catuparivaṭṭa; Nandopananda; Apalāladamana; Raṭṭhapālagajjita; Ālavakagajjita; Gūḷhaummaga(-ja); Gūḷhavessantara(-ja)** (Sp 742,24–31, cf. § 270).

<sup>721</sup> Norman 1994: 17–21, where also the unnecessary variety of names coined for this literature has been collected.

Further, whole collections are mentioned:

**Vaṇṇapiṭaka; Aṅgulimālapīṭaka; Gūḷhavinaya; Vedallapiṭaka** (Sp 742,29–31)<sup>722</sup>.

All these scriptures are characterized as *abuddhavadāna*, Sp 742,31<sup>723</sup>. Nothing is known about their contents except that both Jātakas mentioned obviously seem to be apocryphal counterparts to the corresponding texts in the orthodox Mahāvihāra-Tiṭṭaka.

---

<sup>722</sup> These names of texts are omitted in the Chinese translation of Sp (§ 209); cf. Sp 232,8; Spk II 201,24–202,1 (cf. § 140); Sv 566,32sq. and Collins 1990: 111sq. note 32.

<sup>723</sup> Cf. § 179 on the *Meṇḍakamilindapaṇḍita*.

## XIII. Letters and Inscriptions

### XIII.1 Letters

**438.** Sending letters of admonition to spiritual friends or even to kings<sup>724</sup> is a fairly old practice among Buddhists. Few such letters (*lekha*) survive. They have been described in the excellent thesis of S.Dietz<sup>725</sup>.

In Pāli only two older specimens belonging to this category are extant, while there is a larger number of more recent ones<sup>726</sup>:

**Saddhammopāyana (Saddh: 4.5.7):** Edition: R.Morris, JPTS 1887: 35–98; translation: A.A.Hazlewood: *Saddhammopāyana*. The Gift-offering of the True Dhamma. JPTS 12.1988: 65–168.

**439.** According to a commentary on *Saddh* the author was the Mahāthera Ānanda, who bears the title *Abhayagirikavicakravartī* in a commentary to *Saddh*<sup>727</sup>. Therefore, this text is sometimes attributed to the *Abhayagirivihāra* literature, and consequently it has been attempted to find teachings diverging from the *Mahāvihāra* orthodoxy in *Saddh*<sup>728</sup>.

The date of *Saddh* is uncertain. The tradition reported by H.Nevill (1848–1897) which assumes that this Ānanda is identical with the author of the *Mūla-ṭ* (§ 355), is of hardly any value<sup>729</sup>.

It has even been surmised that *Saddh* is ultimately based on Candragomin's *Śiṣyalekha*<sup>730</sup>.

---

<sup>724</sup> Hahn 1992.

<sup>725</sup> Dietz 1984: 92–113.

<sup>726</sup> Cf. Kitsudo 1974; Somadasa 1990: 7sq., and § 339 on *Sīmāv*.

<sup>727</sup> Malalasekera 1928: 212.

<sup>728</sup> Upās p. 60–63 and Norman 1991: 45–47, cf. § 45.

<sup>729</sup> Somadasa 1987: 242–244.

<sup>730</sup> Godakumbura 1955: 211, cf. Dietz 1984: 31–37.

440. It is said that this description of the Buddhist teaching and lay ethics in 621 verses and 19 chapters was to be sent to a *piyasabrahmacārī* “dear fellow monk” named Buddhāsoma (Saddh 3), which allows to include Saddh into the category of letters.

441. The date of the following letter can be ascertained because of historical events mentioned:

[*Mahānāgakulasandesa* (Mānāvulūsandesa) (Mānāv-s: 4.2.6)]: Edition: L.D.Barnett, JRAS 1905, 265–283<sup>731</sup>.

This letter in 62 verses similar to a Skt. *kāvya* was sent by a Mahāthera Nāgasena residing in the Ceylonese city of Mahānāgakula (Sgh. Mānāvulū)<sup>732</sup> as an answer to an earlier (lost) letter by the Burmese Mahāthera Kassapa residing in Arimaddanapura (Pagan). Only the beginning, a poetical description of both cities, is extant. Historical details such as the reference to the reforms of Parakkamabāhu I. allow to date the letter to the 13th century.

442. Moreover, quite a few letters exchanged between monks of the different Theravāda countries at a much later date are extant:

*Sandesakathā* ([Sand-k]: 4.2.5): Edition: I.P.Minayeff, JPTS 1885: 17–28.

This letter has been written in AD 1801 by Nānābhivamsa (§ 382) to testify the ordination of three Sāmaṇeras and a layman from Ceylon in Burma. When they travelled back home, they were provided with copies of *Abhidh-s*, *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* and the *Samkhepavaṇṇanā* by Chaṭṭa<sup>733</sup> (Sand-k 28,27–30). Reference is also made to the *ekamsika*-controversy, attributed here to monks from northern Siam (Yonaka) (Sand-k 26,20–27,26)<sup>734</sup>.

443. A long letter sent by the Aggamahāsenāpati of Siam from Siri Ayuddhā-devamahānagara (Ayuthaya) to the royal court at Sirivaḍḍhanapura (Kandy) in AD 1756 is important for the tradition of Pāli

<sup>731</sup> Cf. Kitsudo 1974: 1097–1093; the relevant manuscripts have been described in Somadasa 1993:108–111.

<sup>732</sup> This city is referred to Mhv LXI 23 etc.

<sup>733</sup> Cf. *Abhidh-s-samkhepavaṇṇanā* (3.8.1,3), § 344 note 559 (?).

<sup>734</sup> Cf. v.Hinüber 1995a: 39.

texts, because no fewer than 97 manuscripts comprising altogether 75 titles to be reintroduced to Ceylon from Siam accompanied this letter<sup>735</sup>.

A comprehensive collection and study of this interesting material are desiderata<sup>736</sup>.

### XIII.2 Inscriptions

**444.** Old Pāli inscriptions, which are extremely rare in Ceylon, do not contribute much to Pāli literature. They are found in India and SE Asia and often contain very short passages quoted from canonical Pāli texts. Though no new texts come to light, this evidence, small as it may be, underlines the astonishing stability of the Pāli tradition<sup>737</sup> and sometimes also contributes considerably to the dating of texts (cf. § 404).

**445.** This is particularly true for the Pagan inscription of AD 1442, which, though not written in Pāli, records a donation to a monastery including a long list of altogether 295 texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Burmese<sup>738</sup>.

The inscribed plaques discovered in Pagan in the East and West Petleik pagodas built in about AD 1200 are of exceptional importance for the history of the Jātaka-collection<sup>739</sup>.

**446.** A fairly long Pāli text is found in the Kalyāṇī inscription erected by Dhammaceti, king of Pegu, in 1476. As the inscription records the establishment of a *śīmā*<sup>740</sup>, it belongs to the Vinaya literature. Vinaya texts used for this purpose have also been enumerated (§ 339).

The whole text Tipiṭaka as sanctioned by the Vth council was engraved in stone in Burma in the 19th century. This edition also includes Nett, Peṭ and Mil<sup>741</sup>.

<sup>735</sup> Edited by Supaphan 1988; cf. v.Hinüber 1988b, cf. § 424.

<sup>736</sup> The collection by Buddhadatta 1962 is inaccessible to me. On Siam cf. Supaphan 1986: 484–554.

<sup>737</sup> The relevant material has been collected in v.Hinüber 1985a. The material is still growing by archaeological finds in SE-Asia, cf. JPTS 21. 1995: 199–213.

<sup>738</sup> Bode 1909: 101–109; Luce/Tin Htway 1976 with an important discussion of the historical background of this inscription.

<sup>739</sup> Luce 1966: 294, cf. § 109.

<sup>740</sup> Cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992: 451 for reference to Taw Sein-Ko 1893 (additions).

<sup>741</sup> Bollée 1968b: 493sq. — On a similar earlier edition in China: Lancaster 1989.

## XIV. Lost Texts and Non-Theravāda Texts Quoted in Pāli Literature

447. Although there do not seem to be many gaps in the tradition of the Mahāvihāra literature<sup>742</sup>, the texts of other branches of Theravāda such as the Abhayagirivihāra literature are almost completely lost<sup>743</sup>. It remains an open question, whether or not some, if not all apocryphal texts (§ 437) belong to this tradition.

448. Occasionally texts are mentioned which have disappeared altogether, such as the *Ñāṇodaya*, thought to be an early work by Buddhaghosa (§ 207)<sup>744</sup> or the *Mahādhammahadaya* (§ 130), which replaced the *Kathāvatthu* rejected by the *Vitaṇḍavādins* as non-canonical.

While no trace of the contents of the *Pannavāra* referred to by *Vajirabuddhi* (Vjb 18,15, cf. § 210 note 379) remains, quite a few passages from lost *Vinaya* commentaries survive as quotations<sup>745</sup>.

The *Anāgatavaṃsa* quoted in the *Visuddhimagga* (§ 200 note 347) is different from the extant *Anāg*. Two lost texts on the history of relics are the *Kesadhātuvamṣa* (§ 195 note 343) and the *Mahābodhivaṃsakathā* (§ 191) referred to in *Mhv* and *Mhv-ṭ* respectively.

Texts such as the *Peṭaka* (§ 171) or *Sumatāvātāra* (§ 340) seem to have belonged to the exegetical literature. This is apparently also true for the *Sārasamāsa*<sup>746</sup> and for the *Saddagantha* and the *Ñāyagantha* referred to once in *Paṭi-a* = *Nidd-a* (§ 295).

---

<sup>742</sup> Exceptionally heavy losses are three *Jātakas*: § 109 and the missing end of *Mil*: § 178; cf. also § 55 note 105 and v.Hinüber 1990. – Does *Pj* II 223,20–24 refer to a lost *Jātaka*?

<sup>743</sup> Cf. § 45 note 88.

<sup>744</sup> *Vism-trsl.* (*Nyanatiloka*) 1952:VII note 1 conjectures that it “might be extant in Chinese translation” (?).

<sup>745</sup> Cf. § 210; § 358 note 575 on a lost(?) commentary on *Kkh*, *Bollée* 1969 and *CPD* (*Epil.*) 1.2,00. The *Anugaṇṭhipada* mentioned by *Vajirabuddhi* (§ 368 n. 588) may refer to a lost commentary.

<sup>746</sup> *Mori* 1988b: 44, cf. *Sv-pt* p. LXIII.



The Jātatthakī (§ 434), found only in the enumeration of titles in the Pagan inscription of AD 1442, seems to have belonged to the SE Asian Pāli literature.

The Līnatthadīpanīṭikā, a subcommentary on the Paṭisambhidā-magga, mentioned by Vācissara in his *nigamana* to Thūp (§ 297) seems to be different from the surviving Pāṭis-gp. If so, the text is lost.

A text nearly lost according to tradition is the Niddesa (§ 116).

**449.** Non-Theravāda literature is very rarely mentioned. Thus Bhārayuddha (Mahābhārata) or Sītāharaṇa (Rāmāyaṇa) are given as examples for “useless stories” (*niratthakā kathā*) (Sv 76,13=Spk II 148,4), and Bhārata-Rāmāyaṇādi, Sv 84,15 occurs in the definition of *akkhāna*<sup>747</sup>.

Even the Tamil poem Kuṇḍalakesivattthu by Nāgasena is referred to once (§ 338), which may be identical with or an adaptation of the lost Kuṇṭalakēcī by Nāthagupta<sup>748</sup>.

**450.** Interesting light is shed on the history of Indian lexicography by the “lexicon verses<sup>749</sup>”, which are too early to be ascribed to any known Indian Kośa. The late Sv-nṭ (§ 382) quotes a verse from an otherwise unknown dictionary called *Madhukosa*<sup>750</sup>.

<sup>747</sup> Cf. also Cūlavamsa, trsl. W.Geiger II 1930: 317 (index).

<sup>748</sup> Cf. Zvelebil 1974: 142.

<sup>749</sup> Cf. § 231; 293; 320.

<sup>750</sup> Sv-nṭ I 423,19–21\*, cf. CPD s.v. *kabaḷaggaha*.

## XV. Bibliography

- Adikaram, E. W. (1946): *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo
- Alabaster, H. (1871): *The Wheel of the Law. Buddhism Illustrated from Siamese Sources*. London
- x Allon, M. (1994): *Some Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and Their Mnemonic Function*. Thesis Cambridge
- Alsdorf, L. (1928): *Der Kumārapālapratibodha. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṃśa und der Erzählungs-Literatur der Jainas*. Hamburg. *Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 2
- ✓ Alsdorf, L. (1957): *Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-Jātaka*. WZKSO 1, 1–70 = *Kleine Schriften* Wiesbaden 1974, 270–339
- x Alsdorf, L. (1963/4): *The Ākhyāna Theory Reconsidered*. JOIB 13, 195–207 = *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden 1974, 36–48
- Alsdorf, L. (1965): *Les Études Jaina. État Présent et Taches Futures*. Paris
- Alsdorf, L. (1967): *Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons metrisch hergestellt und textkritisch untersucht*. AWL 1967, Nr. 4
- Alsdorf, L. (1971): *Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura*. WZKS 15, 23–56
- Arunachalam, M. (1979): *The Kalabhras in the Pandiya Country and Their Impact on the Life and Letters There*. *Journal of the Madras University* 61, 1–168 (pagination of the off print)
- x Balbir, N. (1995): *Formes et usages de la concaténation en prakrit*, in: *Sauhar-dyamaṅgalam. Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on his 70th Birthday*. Stockholm, 5–26
- Bapat, P. V. (1937): *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga. A Comparative Study*. Poona
- Bapat, P. V. (1964): *Vimuktimārga. Dhutaṅga-Nirdeśa. A Tibetan Text Critically Edited and Translated into English*. Delhi
- Bapat, P. V. (1967): *Vimativinodanī, a Vinaya Commentary and Kuṇḍalakesi-vatthu, a Tamil Poem*. JIH 45, 689–694
- Bapat, P. V./Hirakawa, A. (1970): *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha. A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā ... Translated into English*. Poona. Bhandarkar Oriental Series No. 10
- x Bureau, A. (1979): *La Composition et les Étapes de Formation Progressive du Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. BEFEO 66, 45–109
- Bureau, A. (1992): *Le Rituelisme Bouddhique chez I-tsing*. AS 45.1, 37–48

- Barua, B. M. (1945): *Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa: Their Contemporaneity*. UCR 3, 49–57 = *Buddhadatta 1957*: 169–188
- Barua, D. K. (1967/8): *Buddha's Discourses to the Lay People*. JOIB 17, 376–414
- Barua, D. K. (1971): *An Analytical Study of Four Nikāyas*. Calcutta
- Basham, A. L. (1951): *History and Doctrine of the Ājīvikas, a Vanished Religion*. London
- Bechert, H. (1955/1957): *Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Sekten in Indien und Ceylon*. La Nouvelle Clío 7–9 (Mélanges C. Courtois et W. Marçais), 311–360
- Bechert, H. (1958): *Über das Apadānabuch*. WZKSO 2, 1–21
- Bechert, H. (1961): *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Verssammlungen aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrithandschriften I: Die Anavataptagāthā und die Sthaviragāthā*. Berlin. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden VI. [Thesis München 1956]
- Bechert, H. (1966/1988): *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Ländern des Theravāda-Buddhismus. Band I.* <sup>1</sup>Frankfurt/<sup>2</sup>Göttingen
- Bechert, H. (1967/8): *Narasīhagāthā and Śrī-Śākyasīnphastotra*. Adyar Library Bulletin 31/32, 567–579
- Bechert, H. (1969): *Zum Ursprung der Geschichtsschreibung im indischen Kulturbereich*. NAWG Jg. 1969 Nr. 2 [cf. Bechert 1972]
- Bechert, H. (1972): *The Beginnings of Buddhist Historiography in Ceylon*. Journal of the Bihar Research Society 58 (Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Jha Felicitation Volume), 83–94 [English version of Bechert 1969]
- Bechert, H. (1974): *A Fragment of the Vimānāvadāna, A Canonical Buddhist Sanskrit Work*, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*. Dordrecht, 19–25
- Bechert, H. (1978): *Remarks on the Astrological Sanskrit Literature from Sri Lanka*, in: *Senarat Paranavitana Commemoration Volume*. Leiden, 45–47
- Bechert, H. (1979a): *Burmese Manuscripts Part I*. Wiesbaden. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland Band XXIII, 1
- Bechert, H. (1979b): *Remarks on Four Buddhist Sanskrit Works Composed in Sri Lanka*, in: *Studies in Pali and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*. Delhi, 25–27
- Bechert, H. (1985): *Das Pratyayaśataka, ein Werk der indischen Spruchweisheit aus Sri Lanka*. NAWG Jg 1985 Nr. 6
- Bechert, H. (1986): *Die Lebenszeit des Buddha – das älteste feststehende Datum der indischen Geschichte?* NAWG Jg 1986 Nr. 4
- Bechert, H. (1987a): *Review of Norman (1983)*, IJ 30, 134–139
- Bechert, H. (1987b): *Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung*. StII 13/14 (Festschrift W. Rau), 5–16

- Bechert, H. (1988): "Alte Vedhas" im Pāli-Kanon. Die metrische Struktur der buddhistischen Bekenntnisformel. NAWG Jg 1988 Nr. 4
- Bechert, H. (1989): Vimuttimaggā and Amatakaravaṇṇanā, in: Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies. P. V. Bapat Felicitation Volume. Delhi, 11-14
- Bechert, H. (1991a): Didactic Poetry of Indian Origin in Burma and Sri Lanka, in: Kalyāṇa-Mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume. Delhi, 79-85
- Bechert, H. (1991b): A Metric "Varṇaka" in the Pāli Scriptures, in: Studies in Buddhism and Culture in Honour of Egaku Mayeda on His 65th Birthday. Tokyo, 23(758)-30 (751)
- Bechert, H. (1992a): Buddha-Field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source. IJ 35, 95-108
- Bechert, H. (1992b): The Writing Down of the Tripiṭaka in Pāli. WZKS 36, 45-53
- Bechert, H. (1993): The Nikāyas of Mediaeval Sri Lanka and the Unification of the Sangha by Parākramabāhu I, in: Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A. K. Warder. Toronto, 11-21
- Bechert, H./v.Simson, G. (1973-1994): Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden/Sanskrit Dictionary of the Buddhist Texts from the Turfan Finds. Band I. Göttingen
- Bechert, H./v.Simson, G. (1993): Einführung in die Indologie. Stand, Methoden, Aufgaben. Darmstadt (second edition)
- Bernhard, F. (1969): Zum Titel des sog. "Udānavarga", in: XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg. Vorträge Teil 3. ZDMG Supplementa I. Wiesbaden, 872-881
- Bizot, F./v. Hinüber, O. (1994): Iti-pi-so-ratanamālā. La guirlande de bijoux. Paris
- Bode, M. (1909): The Pali Literature of Burma. London [rev.: Duroiselle, 1911 (reprinted as an appendix in the reprint of Bode 1909, Rangoon 1965); Bollée 1968a]
- Bode, M. (1911): The Legend of Raṭṭhapāla in the Pāli Apadāna and Buddhaghosa's Commentary, in: Mélanges d'Indianisme offerts ... à S. Lévi. Paris, 183-192
- Bollée, W. B. (1968a): Review of Bode 1909. IJ 11, 311-318
- Bollée, W. B. (1968b): Some Less Known Burmese Pāli Texts, in: Pratidānam Studies Presented to F. B. J. Kuiper. The Hague, 493-499
- Bollée, W. B. (1969): Die Stellung der Vinaya-Ṭīkā in der Pāli-Literatur, in: XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 21. bis 27. Juli 1968 in Würzburg. Vorträge Teil 3. ZDMG Supplementa I. Wiesbaden, 824-835
- Bond, G. D. (1979): The Nature and Meaning of the Netti-Pakaraṇa, in: Studies in Pāli and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap. Delhi, 29-39

- Bond, G. D. (1980): *The Netṭi-Pakaraṇa: A Theravāda Method of Interpretation*, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*. London, 16–28
- Bond, G. D. (1982): *The Word of the Buddha. The Tipiṭaka and Its Interpretation in Theravada Buddhism*. Colombo
- Borsani, G. (1942): *Prospetti e indice del Tipiṭaka*. Milano. Università Cattolica del Sacro Coure. Saggi e Ricerche. Scienze Orientali Vol. I
- Bronkhorst, J. (1985): *Dharma and Abhidharma*. BSOAS 48, 305–320
- Bronkhorst, J. (1993): *Kathāvatthu and Vijñānakāya*, in: *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte (Bruxelles et Liège 24–27 septembre 1989)*. Louvain-la-Neuve, 57–61
- Buddhadatta, A. P. (1944): *Who was Buddhaghosa?* UCR 3, 77–85 = *Buddhadatta 1957: 142–157*
- Buddhadatta, A. P. (1945): *The Great Author of the Summaries, Contemporary of Buddhaghosa*. UCR 3, 34–40 = *Buddhadatta 1957: 158–168*
- Buddhadatta, A. P. (1957): *Corrections to Geiger's Mahāvamsa etc. Ambalangoda*
- Buddhadatta, P. (1962): *Pāḷi sandesāvaḷī*. Colombo
- Burlingame, E. W. (1918): *Sources of the Pāli Commentaries*. JAOS 38, 267 sq.
- Burnouf, E./Lassen, Ch. (1826): *Essai sur le pali ou langue sacrée de la presqu'île au-delà du Gange*. Paris

- Caillat, C. (1965/1975): *Les expiations dans le rituel ancien des religieux Jaina*. Paris. Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8°, Fasc. 25 = *Atonements in the Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks*. Ahmedabad. L. D. Series 49
- Caillat, C. (1993): *Words for Violence in the "Seniors" of the Jaina Canon*, in: *Jaina Studies in Honour of Josef Deleu*. Tokyo, 207–236
- Chaudhuri, J. B. (1939–1943): *The Contribution of Women to Sanskrit Literature*. Calcutta. I (1943), IIA (1939), III/IV (1940), VI B (1940) [all published?]
- Cœdès, G. (1915): *Note sur les ouvrages palis composés en pays thai*. BEFEO 15, 39–46
- Cœdès, G. (1925): *Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse de Laos occidental*. BEFEO 25, 1–202
- Cœdès, G. (1966): *Catalogues des Manuscrits en Pāli, Laotien et Siamois Provenant de la Thaïlande*. Copenhagen
- Cœdès, G. (1968): *Une vie indochinoise du Buddha: la Paṭhamasambodhi*, in: *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la Mémoire de L. Renou*. Paris, 217–227
- Collins, S. (1990): *On the Very Idea of the Pāli Canon*. JPTS 15, 89–126
- Collins, S. (1993): *The Discourse on What is Primary (Aggañña-Sutta)*. An Annotated Translation. JIPh 21, 301–393
- Cort, J. E. (1995): *Genres of Jain History*. JIPh 23, 469–506

- Cousins, L. (1972): Dhammapāla and the Tīkā Literature. Religion. Journal of Religion and Religions 2, 159–165
- Cousins, L. (1991): The “Five Points” and the Origins of Buddhist Schools, in: The Buddhist Forum II, 27–60 = Buddhist Essays. A Miscellany. A Memorial Volume in Honour of H. Saddhātissa. London 1992, 79–126
- Das, A. (1989/1990): The Pajjamadhu – A Critical Study. Journal of the Department of Pali, Calcutta. 5, 35–72
- Das Gupta, K. (1978): *Viśvantarāvadāna*. Eine buddhistische Legende. Edition eines Textes auf Sanskrit und auf Tibetisch, eingeleitet und übersetzt. Berlin 1978 (Thesis Berlin 1977)
- Davidson, R. M. (1990): An Introduction to the Standards of Scriptural Authenticity in Indian Buddhism, in: Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha ed. by E. Buswell, Honolulu, 291–325
- Demiéville, P. (1924): Les versions chinoises du Milindapañha. BEFEO 24, 1–264
- Demiéville, P. (1950): A propos du concile de Vaiśālī. T’oung Pao 40, 239–296
- Denis, E. (1975): La Lokapaññatti et la Légende Birmane d’Asoka. JAS 97–116
- Deshpande, M. M. (1984): Introducing the Milindapañha-Aṭṭhakathā of Thāton Mingun Sayadaw, in: Amṛtadhārā. R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume. Delhi, 95–103
- Dhadphale, M. G. (1978): Significance of the Title Telakaṭṭhagāthā, in: Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference. 28th Session, Karnataka University, Dharwar, November 1976. Poona, 353–357
- Dhirasekera, J. (1970): A Historical Introduction to the Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha of Vācissara Thera. Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū) 1, 76–73
- Dickson, J. F. (1876): The Pātimokkha Being the Buddhist Office of the Confession of Priests. The Pāli Text with a Translation, and Notes. JRAS, 62–130
- Dietz, S. (1984): Die buddhistische Briefliteratur Indiens. Wiesbaden. Asia-tische Forschungen Band 84
- Dietz, S. (1989a): Remarks on a Hitherto Unknown Cosmological Text in the Kanjur. Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Tomus 43, 273–283
- Dietz, S. (1989b): A Brief Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments of the Lokaprajñaptiśāstra. Annual Memoirs of the Otani University Shin Buddhist Comprehensive Research Institute 7, 79–86
- Dietz, S. (1992): Remarks on the Kāraṇaprajñaptiśāstra, in: Buddhist Studies Past and Present. Tenth International Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Paris 18–21 July 1991. Paris, 87–94

- Dietz, S. (1994): Bemerkungen zum Kāraṇaprajñaptiśāstra, in: XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 8. bis 13.4.1991 in München. Vorträge. ZDMG Supplementa 10. Stuttgart, 295–306
- Dube, S. N. (1980): Cross Currents in Early Buddhism. Delhi
- Duroiselle, Ch. (1911): Review of Bode 1909, JBRS 1.1, 119–122
- Dutt, N. (1939–1959): Gilgit Manuscripts. I–IV. Srinagar, Calcutta
- Edgerton, F. (1953): Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary. New Haven
- Endō, T. (1988): A Study of the Rasavāhinī With Special Reference to the Concept of Dāna. Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū) XVIII [misprinted "XVII" on the title page], 161–179
- Endō, T. (1983): The Asgiriya Manuscript of the Pāli Vimuttimaggā: An Inquiry into Its Authenticity. Kalyāṇī. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Kelaniya 2, 100–108
- Enomoto, F. (1989): On the Annihilation of *karman* in Early Buddhism, in: Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan, no. 34, 43–55.
- Falk, H. (1988): Vedische Opfer im Pāli Kanon. BEI 6, 225–254
- Falk, H. (1994): Die Kosmogonie von RV X 72. WZKS 38, 1–22
- Filliozat, J. (1992): Documents Useful for the Identification of Pāli Manuscripts of Cambodia, Laos and Thailand. JPTS 16, 13–54
- Filliozat, J. (1993): The Commentaries to the Anāgatavaṃsa in the Pāli Manuscripts of the Paris Collections. JPTS 19, 43–63
- Finot, L. (1917): Recherches sur la littérature laotienne. BEFEO 17, 1–219
- Finot, L. (1921): La légende de Buddhaghosa, in: Ciquantenaire de l'École des Hautes Études. Paris, 101–119 = Legend of Buddhaghosa. Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta 11, 1924, 65–86 (trsl. by P. C. Bagchi)
- Finot, L. (1932): Mahāparinibbānasuttanta and Cullavagga. IHQ 8, 241–246
- Franke, R. O. (1907): Dīpavaṃsa und Mahāvaṃsa. WZKM 21, 203–250, 317–352 = Franke 1978: 1297–1380
- Franke, R. O. (1914): Majjhimanikāya und Suttanipāta. WZKS 28, 261–276 = Franke 1978: 1018–1033
- Franke, R. O. (1915): Der einheitliche Grundgedanke des Majjhimanikāya: Die Erziehung gemäß der Lehre (*dharmavinaya*). WZKS 29, 134–171 = Franke 1978: 1101–1138
- Franke, R. O. (1978): Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden, 2 Volumes
- Frankfurter, O. (1883): Handbook of Pāli. London
- Frauwallner, E. (1952): Die buddhistischen Konzile. ZDMG 102, 240–261 = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1982, 649–670
- Frauwallner, E. (1953): Geschichte der indischen Philosophie. I. Band. Salzburg

- Frauwallner, E. (1956): *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*. Rome. Serie Orientale Roma VIII
- Frauwallner, E. (1963): *Abhidharma-Studien I. Pañcaskandham und Pañcavastukam*. WZKSO 7, 20–36
- Frauwallner, E. (1964): *Abhidharma-Studien II. Die kanonischen Abhidharma-Werke*, WZKSO 8, 59–99
- Frauwallner, E. (1971a): *Abhidharma-Studien III. Der Abhisamayavādaḥ*, WZKS 15, 69–102
- Frauwallner, E. (1971b/1972): *Abhidharma-Studien IV. Der Abhidharma der anderen Schulen*. WZKS 15, 103–121; 16, 95–152
- ✓ Frauwallner, E. (1973): *Abhidharma-Studien V. Der Sarvāstivādaḥ. Eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie*. WZKS 17, 97–121
- Frauwallner, E. (1984): *Über den geschichtlichen Wert der alten ceylonesischen Chroniken*, in: *Nachgelassene Werke I: Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen* hg.v. E. Steinkellner. Wien. ÖAW Sitzungsberichte 438. Band, 7–33 [= Erich Frauwallner's Posthumous Essays trsl. by J. Soni. Delhi 1994]
- Fussman, G. (1993): *L'Indo-Grec Ménandre ou Paul Demiéville revisité*. JAs 281, 61–138
- ✗ Gabaude, L. (1991): *Controverses Modernes autour du Vessantarajātaka*. Cahiers de l'Asie du Sud-Est 29/30, 51–73
- ✗ Galloway, B. (1991): *Thus Have I Heard: At one Time ...*, IJ 34, 87–104
- Geiger, W. (1901): *Dīpavaṃsa und Mahāvaṃsa, die beiden Chroniken der Insel Ceylon*, in: *Festschrift seiner Kgl. Hoheit dem Prinzregenten Luitpold von Bayern zum 80. Geburtstag dargebracht*. Erlangen und Leipzig, 139–162 = Geiger 1973: 233–256
- Geiger, W. (1905): *Dīpavaṃsa und Mahāvaṃsa und die geschichtliche Überlieferung in Ceylon*. Leipzig [English: *The Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa and their historical development (!) in Ceylon*, trsl. E. M. Coomaraswamy. Colombo 1908]
- Geiger, W. (1916/1943): *Pāli. Literatur und Sprache*. Straßburg = Pāli. Literature and Language translated by B. Ghosh. Calcutta
- Geiger, W. (1929): *Die Quellen des Mahāvaṃsa*. ZII 7, 259–269 = Geiger 1973: 273–283
- Geiger, W. (1960/1986): *Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times*. <sup>1</sup>Wiesbaden, <sup>2</sup>Stuttgart
- Geiger, W. (1973): *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden
- Gethin, R. M. L. (1992): *The Buddhist Path to Awakening. A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā*. Leiden. Brill's Indological Library 7 [rev.: J. W.de Jong, IJ 37. 1994, 384–387]
- Godakumbura, C. E. (1943): *References to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature*. UCR 1, 86–93



- Godakumbura, C. E. (1950): *Sādhucaritodaya*. An Unnoticed Pāli Poem. *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. Centenary Volume (1845–1945). New Series 1, 95–103
- Godakumbura, C. E. (1955): *Sinhalese Literature*. Colombo
- Godakumbura, C. E. (1969): *Chapada and Chapada Saddhammajotipāla*. JBRs 52, 1–7
- Godakumbura, C. E. (1980): *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts*. Copenhagen [rev.: ZDMG 132. 1982, 448]
- Godakumbura, C. E. (1983): *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts*. Copenhagen [rev.: ZDMG 136. 1986, 224; AO 48. 1987, 235–239]
- Gombrich, R. (1980): The Significance of Former Buddhas in the Theravāda Tradition, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*. London, 62–72
- Gombrich, R. (1986–1992): Why Six Former Buddhas? JOR 56/62, 326–330
- Gombrich, R. (1987): Three Souls, One or None: The Vagaries of a Pāli Pericope. JPTS 11, 72–78
- Gombrich, R. (1988=1990): Recovering the Buddha's Message, in: *Buddhist Forum I*, 5–20 = Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference August 23–29 1987: II. Early Buddhism and Madhyamaka. Leiden
- Gonda, J. (1975): *Vedic Literature (Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas)*. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature I 1
- Gonda, J. (1977): *The Ritual Sūtras*. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature I 2
- Grönbold, G. (1984): Der buddhistische Kanon. Eine Bibliographie. Wiesbaden
- Guha, D. (1982/1983): The Total Number of Verses in the Buddhavaṃsa. *Journal of the Department of Pali, Calcutta*. 1, 49–52
- Hacker, P. (1959): *Prahlāda. Werden und Wandlungen einer Idealgestalt*. AWL 1959, Nr. 9; 13
- Härtel, H. (1993): *Excavations at Sonkh. 2500 Years of a Town in Mathura District*. Berlin
- Hahn, M. (1992): *Mātṛceṭas Brief an den König Kaṇṣka*. AS 46,1, 147–179
- Halbfaß, W. (1991): *Tradition and Reflection. Explorations in Indian Thought*. New York
- Hamm, F. R. (1961): Rev. of Pande 1957. ZDMG 110, 206–210
- Hardy, E. (1897): Ein Beitrag zur Frage, ob Dhammapāla im Nālandasaṅghārāma seine Kommentare geschrieben. ZDMG 51, 105–127
- Hardy, E. (1899): Eine buddhistische Bearbeitung der Kṛṣṇa-Sage. ZDMG 53, 25–50
- Hartmann, J.-U. (1994): Der śaṭsūtraka-Abschnitt des in Ostturkestan überlieferten Dīrghāgama, in: XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 8. bis

- 13.4.1991 in München. Vorträge. ZDMG Supplementa 10. Stuttgart, 324-334
- Hazra, K. L. (1986): *The Buddhist Annals and Chronicles of South-East Asia*. Delhi
- Hazra, K. L. (1991): *Studies on the Pāli Commentaries*. Delhi
- Hazra, K. L. (1994): *Pāli. Literature and Language. A Systematic Survey and Historical Study*. Vol. I, II. Delhi
- ✓ Hecker, H. (1993): *Dhammapada. Ein bibliographischer Führer durch Übersetzungen der berühmtesten buddhistischen Spruchsammlung*. Konstanz
- ✗ v. Hinüber, O. (1976): Sprachliche Beobachtungen zum Aufbau des Pāli-Kanons. StII 2, 7-40 = *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies* 1994, 62-75
- v. Hinüber, O. (1977): Zur Geschichte des Sprachnamens Pāli, in: *Beiträge zur Indienforschung Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Berlin, 237-246 = *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies* 1994, 76-90
- v. Hinüber, O. (1979): Über drei Begriffe der buddhistischen Rechtssprache: *issaravatā, gīvā, und bhaṇḍadeyya*. IT 7, 275-279 = *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies* 1994, 116-122
- v. Hinüber, O. (1982a): Upāli's Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama, in: *Indological and Buddhist Studies. Volume in Honour of J. W. de Jong*. Canberra, 243-251
- v. Hinüber, O. (1982b): The Tittira-Jātaka and the Extended Mahāvamsa. JSS 70, 71-75
- v. Hinüber, O. (1983): Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma. NAWG Nr. 3
- v. Hinüber, O. (1985a): Epigraphical Varieties of Continental Pāli from Devnī-mori and Ratnagiri, in: *Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions. Essays in Honour of S. Kumoi on his Seventieth Birthday*. Kyoto. 185-200
- v. Hinüber, O. (1985b): Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien, in: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur I. Teil*. Göttingen. AAWG 149, 57-75
- v. Hinüber, O. (1986): Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick. Wien. ÖAW Sitzungsberichte, 467. Band
- v. Hinüber, O. (1987): Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli. StII 13/14 (Festschrift W. Rau), 101-127 = *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies* 1994, 198-232
- v. Hinüber, O. (1988a): Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung. AWL 1988, Nr. 8
- v. Hinüber, O. (1988b): Remarks on a List of Books Sent to Ceylon from Siam in the 18th Century. JPTS 12, 175-183
- v. Hinüber, O. (1989): Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. AWL 1989, Nr. 11
- v. Hinüber, O. (1990): Khandhakavatta. Loss of Text in the Pāli Vinayaṭṭaka? JPTS 15, 127-138

- v. Hinüber, O. (1991): The Oldest Pāli Manuscript. Four Folios of the Vinaya-Piṭaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu. AWL 1991, Nr. 6
- v. Hinüber, O. (1992): The Arising of an Offence: *āpattisamuttāna*, JPTS 16, 55–69
- v. Hinüber, O. (1993): Pāli und Lānnā (Nord-Thai) in Kolophonen alter Palmblatthandschriften aus Nord-Thailand, in: Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix. Innsbruck, 223–236
- v. Hinüber, O. (1994a): Die neun Aṅgas. Ein früher Versuch zur Einteilung buddhistischer Texte. WZKS 38 (Festschrift G. Oberhammer), 121–135
- v. Hinüber, O. (1994b): Untersuchungen zur Mündlichkeit früherer mittelindischer Texte der Buddhisten. AWL 1994, Nr. 5
- v. Hinüber, O. (1994c): Vinaya und Abhidhamma. StII 19. 1994 (Festschrift G. Buddruss), 109–122
- v. Hinüber, O. (1994d): Selected Papers on Pāli Studies. Oxford
- v. Hinüber, O. (1995a): Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya. JIABS 18 no. 1, 7–45
- v. Hinüber, O. (1995b): The Nigamanas of the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī and the Kaṇkhāvitaraṇī. JPTS 21: 129–133
- v. Hinüber, O. (1996): Old Age and Old Monks in Pāli Buddhism, in: Old Age and Ageing in Japan and Other Asian Cultures. Wien (in press)
- Hoffmann, F. J. (1992): *Evam me sutaṃ*: Oral Tradition in Nikāya Buddhism, in: Text in Context. Tradition and Hermeneutics in South Asia. New York
- Hopkins, E. W. (1923): A Buddhistic Passage in Manu. JAOS 43, 244–246
- Horner, I. B. (1953/1980): Mahā- and Cūlavaggas and Suttas in the Majjhima-Nikāya, UCR 11 = Indianisme et Bouddhisme. Mélanges Offerts à Mgr É. Lamotte. Leuven. Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 23, 191–196
- Horner, I. B. (1981): *Keci* "Some" in the Pāli Commentaries. JPTS 11, 87–95
- Horsch, P. (1966): Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur. Bern
- Hüsken, U. (1993): Die Legende von der Einrichtung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin, in: Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe ... für H. Bechert. Bonn. Indica et Tibetica 22, 151–170
- Hundius, H. (1990): The Colophons of 30 Pāli Manuscripts from Northern Thailand. JPTS 14, 1–173
- Insler, S. (1989/90): The Shattered Head Split and the Epic Tale of Śakuntalā. BEI 7/8, 7–139
- Jacobi, H. (1884): Jaina Sūtras Translated from the Prakrit. London. Part I SBE XXII

- Jacobi, H. (1908/1969): Ruyyaka's Alamkārasarvasva. ZDMG 62, 289–336; 411–458; 597–628 = Schriften zur indischen Poetik und Ästhetik. Darmstadt, 163–290
- Jaini, P. S. (1984): Some Nīti Verses of the Lokaneyyapakaraṇa, in: Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa. Nugegoda, 116–122
- Jaini, P. S. (1988): Stages in the Bodhisattva Career of the Tathāgata Maitreya, in: A. Sponberg and H. Hardacre: Maitreya, The Future Buddha. Cambridge, 54–90
- Jayawardhana, S. (1994): Handbook of Pāli Literature. Colombo.
- Jayawardhana, S. (1995): A Critical Introduction to the Study of Pāli Tīkāṣ, in: Silva/Uragoda 1995: 285–318
- de Jong, J. W. (1972): Rev. of Alsdorf 1967, IJ 12, 207–212
- de Jong, J. W. (1986): Rev. of Stache-Rosen 1984, BSOAS 49, 591sq.
- Kieffer-Pülz, P. (1992[1993]): Die Sīmā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten. Berlin [rev.: O.v. Hinüber, WZKS 40. 1996 (in press)]
- Kieffer-Pülz, P. (1993): Zitate aus der Andhaka-Aṭṭhakathā in der Samantapāsādikā, in: Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe ... für H. Bechert. Bonn. Indica et Tibetica 22, 171–212
- Kielhorn, F., (1886/1969): Notes on the Mahābhāṣya. Indian Antiquary 15, 228–233 = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden I, 214–219
- Kirfel, W. (1927): Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte. Leiden
- Kitsudo, M. (1970): Bibliography of Extracanonical Texts Published in Ceylon. Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū) 1, 72–57 (in Japanese)
- ✕ Kitsudo, M. (1974): On Letters in Pāli. Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū) 22,2 (44), 1100(28)–1093(35)
- ✕ Kölver, B. (1992): Das Symbol *evaṃ*, StII 16/17, 101–107
- Kongkeo Viraprajak (Kōñ<sup>1</sup> keev<sup>2</sup> Virahpraḥcaks) (1982): Gambhīr pai lān chapāp hlvañ nai samāy ratanakosindr (Royal Editions of Canonical Texts on Palm Leaf During the Ratanakosin Period [in Thai]). Bangkok
- ✕ Lamotte, É (1947/1983): La critique de l'authenticité dans le Bouddhisme, in: India Antiqua. A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to J. Ph. Vogel. Leyden, 213–222 = The Assessment of Textual Authenticity in Buddhism. BSR 1,1, 1983/4, 4–15
- Lamotte, É. (1949a/1949b/1970): Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna Tome I, II, III. Louvain
- Lamotte, É. (1956a): Problèmes Concernant les Textes Canoniques “Mineurs”, JAs 244, 249–264
- Lamotte, É. (1956b): Buddhist Controversy over the Five Points. IHQ 32, 148–162

- Lamotte, É (1958/1988): *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien des Origines à l'Ère Śāka*. Leuven. Bibliothèque du Muséon 43 = *History of Indian Buddhism from the Origins to the Śāka Era*. trsl. from the French by S. Webb-Boin. Louvain
- Lancaster, L. R. (1989): *The Rock Cut Canon in China: Findings at Fang-Shan*, in: *The Buddhist Heritage. Papers delivered at the Symposium ... convened ... November 1985* ed. by T. Skorupski. Tring 1989. *Buddhica Britannica. Series Continua I*, 143–156
- Lanman, Ch.R. (1893): *Rigveda V. 40 and Its Buddhist Parallel*, in: *Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth zum Doktor-Jubiläum 24. August 1893*. Stuttgart, 186–190
- Lausunthorn, N. (1995): *Pāṇṇāsa Jātak – praḥvāti leḥ gvām sāmgañ dī<sup>1</sup> mī tò<sup>1</sup> varṇakārma rōy<sup>2</sup> krōṇ khōṇ daiy*. (Pāṇṇāsa Jātaka: Its Genesis and Significance to Thai Poetical Works). Bangkok [Thai with English Summary]
- Laut, J. P. (1993): *Jātaka*, in: *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, Band 7, Lfg. 2/3, 498–507
- Law, B. C. (1933): *A History of Pāli Literature*. London. 2 Vols.
- Law, B. C. (1939): *Some Observations on the Jātaka*. JRAS, 241–251
- Law, B. C. (1946): *Buddhaghosa*. Bombay (recast of the 1923 edition)
- Lawergen, B. (1994): *Buddha as a Musician. An Illustration of a Jātaka story*. *Artibus Asiae* 54, 226–240
- Lévi, S. (1915): *Sur la Récitation Primitive des Textes Bouddhiques*. JAs 401–447 ✓
- Lévi, S. (1925): *Ptolemée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā*, in: *Études Asiatiques à l'Occasion du 25<sup>e</sup> Anniversaire de l'E.F.E.O.* Paris. Tome II, 1–55
- Lévi, S. (1932): *Maitreya le consolateur*, in: *Études d'Orientalisme ... à la Mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*. II. Paris, 355–402
- Lévi, S./Takakusu, J./Demiéville, P. (1929–1994): *Hōbōgirin*. *Dictionaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les Sources Chinoises et Japonaises*. Tokyo, Paris. Fasc. I (1929)–VII (1994); Fascicule Annexe: *Répertoire du Canon Bouddhique Sino-Japonais*. 21978
- Lieberman, V. B. (1976): *A New Look at the Sāsanavaṃsa*. BSOAS 39, 137–149
- Lienhard, S. (1975): *Sur la Structure Poétique des Theratherīgāthā*, JAs 375–396
- Lienhard, S. (1984): *A History of Classical Poetry in Sanskrit – Pāli – Prakrit*. Wiesbaden. *A History of Indian Literature III 1*
- Lottermoser, F. (1982): *Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa. Contributions Towards the Study of the Lost Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā Literature*. Göttingen (Thesis Göttingen 1979)
- Luce, G. H. (1966): *The 550 Jātakas in Burma*. *Artibus Asiae* 19, 291–307

X Luce, G. H./Tin Htway (1976): A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagán, Burma, in: *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*. Colombo, 203–256

Lüders, H. (1940): *Philologica Indica*. Göttingen

Lüders, H. (1941): *Bhārhut und die buddhistische Literatur*. Leipzig. AKM XXVI 3

Lüders, H. (1963): *Bhārhut Inscriptions. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II* 2. Ootacamund

MacQueen, G. (1984): The Doctrines of the Six Heretics According to the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*. IJ 27, 291–307

Malalasekera, G. P. (1928): *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*. Colombo

X Manné, J. (1990): Categories of Sutta in the Pāli Nikāyas and Their Implications for Our Appreciation of the Buddhist Teaching and Literature. JPTS 15, 29–87

Manné, J. (1992): The Dīgha Nikāya Debates: Debating Practices at the Time of the Buddha. BSR 9.2, 117–136

Manné, J. (1993): On the Departure Formula and Its Translation. BSR 10.1, 27–43

Martini, G. (1963): Les Titres des Jātaka dans les Manuscrits Pāli dans la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris. BEFEO 51, 79–95

Martini, G. (1972): Un Jātaka Concernant le Dernier Repas de Buddha. BEFEO 59, 251–255

Martini, G. (1973): *Brapaṃsukūlānisamsaṃ*. BEFEO 60, 55–78

Matsumura, H. (1990): Miscellaneous Notes on the Upāliparipṛcchā and Related Texts. AO 51, 61–113

Matsumura, J. (1992): On the Sahassavattihuppakaraṇa: Researches on the Sīhaḷaṭṭhakathā-Literature. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* (Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū) 41,1 [81], 479(63)–475(66) (in Japanese)

Mayer, A. L. (1992): *Xuanzang. Übersetzer und Heiliger. Xuanzangs Leben und Werk I*. Wiesbaden. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica Band 34

Meisig, K. (1987): *Das Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra*. Wiesbaden. *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie* 19

~ Mellick Cutler, S. (1994): The Pāli Apadāna Collection. JPTS 20, 1–42

Migot, A. (1954): Un grand disciple du Buddha: Śāriputta. BEFEO 46, 405–554

Minayeff, I. P. (1887/1894): *Buddizm. Materialy i issledovanija*. St. Petersburg 1887 = *Recherches sur le Bouddhisme*. Paris 1894. AMG. Bibliothèque d'Études III

Minayeff, I. P. (no date): *Travels and Diaries of India and Burma*. Calcutta

- Mizuno, K. (1993): A Comparative Study of the Theragāthā and the Therīgāthā. *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* 22, 3–83 (in Japanese)
- Mori, S. (1987): The Chronology of the *Sīhaḷavattuppakaraṇa*. *BEI* 5, 221–250
- Mori, S. (1988a): *Sīhaḷavattuppakaraṇa* and Pāli *Aṭṭhakathā* Literature, *Journal of Pāli and Buddhist Studies (Paligaku Bukkyō Bunkagaku)* 1, 47–72 = Mori 1989: 289–314
- Mori, S. (1988b): *Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā* and *Sārasamāsa*. *JPTS* 12, 1–47
- Mori, S. (1989): Studies of the Pāli Commentaries. A Provisional Collection of Articles. Japan (sic!)
- Mori, S. (1994): *The Pāli Aṭṭhakathā Correspondence Table*. Oxford
- Mus, P. (1939): *La Lumière sur les Six Voies*. I. Introduction et Critique des Textes. Paris
- Nakamura, H. (1980): *Indian Buddhism. A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*. Tokyo [rev.: OLZ 1984, 595sq.]
- Ñāṇamoli (1966): *The Pāṭimokkha*. 277 Fundamental Rules of a Bhikkhu. Bangkok
- Nolot, E. (1987): *Samghāvaśeṣa-*, *saṃghātiseṣa-*, *saṃghādisesa-*. *BEI* 5, 251–272
- Nolot, E. (1994): *Textes de Discipline Bouddhique*, in: *Genres Littéraires en Inde*. Sous la responsabilité de N. Balbir. Paris, 103–122
- Norman, K. R. (1979): *Māgadhisms in the Kathāvatthu*, in: *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*. Delhi, 279–287 = *Collected Papers II*. Oxford 1991, 59–70
- Norman, K. R. (1980): Four Etymologies from the *Sabhiya-Sutta*, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*. London, 173–184 = *Collected Papers II*. Oxford 1991, 148–161
- Norman, K. R. (1983): *Pāli Literature Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature VII/2 [rev.: H. Bechert, *IJ* 30.1983, 134–139; E. Steinkellner, *WZKS* 33.1989, 228]; cf. Norman 1994
- Norman, K. R. (1987): An Epithet of Nibbāna, in: *Śramaṇa Vidyā: Studies in Buddhism*. J. Upadhyaya Commemoration Volume. Sarnath 1987, 23–31 = *Collected Papers III*. Oxford 1992, 183–189
- Norman, K. R. (1991): The Literary Works of the Abhayagirivihārins, in: *Kalyāṇa-Mitta*. Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume. Delhi 41–50 = *Collected Papers IV*. 1993, 202–217
- Norman, K. R. (1993a): The Metres of the *Lakkhaṇasutta* (III), in: *Encounter of Wisdom Between Buddhism and Science*. Essays in Honour of K. Tsukamoto. Tokyo, 79–91 = *Collected Papers V*. 1994, 119–131

- Norman, K. R. (1993b): The Metre of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Upāli-sūtra, in: *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A. K. Warder*. Toronto, 113–123 = *Collected Papers V*. 1994, 231–246
- X Norman, K. R. (1994): Pāli Literature: Appendix I. (Additions and Corrections), *Journal of Pāli and Buddhist Studies* (Pāligaku Bukkyō Bunkagaku) 7, 1–22 = *Collected Papers V*. 1994, 262–283
- Obeyesekere, R. (1992): *Jewels of the Doctrine. Stories of the Saddharma Ratnāvaliya*. Delhi
- Ohira, S. (1994): The Twenty-Four Buddhas and the Twenty-Four Tīrthaṅkaras, in: *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*. Reinbek 475–488 [published 1995]
- Oldenberg, H. (1898): *Buddhistische Studien*. ZDMG 52. 613–694 = Oldenberg 1967: 889–972
- Oldenberg, H. (1912a): *Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons*. NAWG 155–218 = Oldenberg 1967: 973–1035
- Oldenberg, H. (1912b): *Studien zum Mahāvastu*. NGWG = Oldenberg 1967: 1037–1068
- Oldenberg, H. (1915): *Die Lehre der Upanishaden und die Anfänge des Buddhismus*. Göttingen
- Oldenberg, H. (1917): *Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa*. AGWA NF 16, Nr. 6 = Oldenberg 1993: 1747–1847
- Oldenberg, H. (1967/1993): *Kleine Schriften, I–III*. Wiesbaden
- Olivelle, P. (1993): *The Āśrama System. The History and Hermeneutics of a Religious Institution*. New York
- Pachow, W. (1956): *A Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa on the Basis of Its Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit and Pāli Versions*. Santiniketan
- Pande, C. P. (1957, <sup>2</sup>1974): *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*. Delhi
- Panglung, J. L. (1981): *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya aufgrund der tibetischen Übersetzung*. Tokyo. *Studia Philologica Buddhica. Monograph Series III*
- Paranavitana, S. (1958): *The God of Adam's Peak*. Ascona. *Artibus Asiae Supplementum 18*
- Paranavitana, S. (1962): *Mahānāma, the Author of the Mahāvamsa*. UCR 20, 269–286
- Pentth, H. (1977): *Reflections on the Saddhamma-Saṅgaha*, JSS 65,1, 259–280
- Pentth, H. (1995): *Which Ratanapañña Composed the Jinakālamālinī?* JSS (in press)
- Perera, F. (1979): *The Early Historiography of Ceylon*. Thesis Göttingen 1974
- Pieris, A. (1978): *The Colophons to the Paramatthamañjūsā and the Discussion on the Date of Ācariya Dhammapāla*, in: *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*. Göttingen. AAWG Nr. 108, 61–77



- Pind, O. (1989, 1990): Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I,II. JPTS 13,14, 33–81, 175–218
- Pind, O. (1992a): Buddhaghosa – His Works and Scholarly Background. Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū) 21,135–156
- Pind, O. (1992b): Mahānāma on the Interpretation of Emptiness. Journal of Pāli and Buddhist Studies (Pāligaku Bukkyō Bunkagaku) 5, 19–33
- Prebish, C. S. (1979): Recent Progress in Vinaya Studies, in: Studies in Pāli and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap. Delhi, 29–306
- Pruitt, W. (1987): References to Pāli in 17th Century French Books. JPTS 11, 121–131
- Pruitt, W. (1994[1995]): Étude linguistique de *nissaya* birmanes. Paris. École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Monographies, n° 174
- Python, P. (1973): Vinaya-vinicchaya-Upāli-paripucchā. Enquête d'Upāli pour une Exégèse de la Discipline. Paris. Collection Jean Przyluski Tome V
- Rahula, T. (1984): The Rasavāhinī and the Sahassavatthu: A Comparison. JIABS 7,2, 169–184
- Rahula, W. (1944): The Sahassavatthu-aṭṭhakathā or Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa. UCR 2, 86–91 = Rahula 1966: XXVII–XXXV
- Rahula, W. (1966): History of Buddhism in Ceylon. Colombo 2 1966
- Ratnapala, N. (1971): The Katikāvatas. Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th to the 18th Century. München. MSS Beiheft N
- Rau, W. (1959): Bemerkungen und nicht-buddhistische Sanskrit-Parallelen zum Pāli-Dhammapada, in: Jñānamuktāvalī. Commemoration Volume in Honour of J. Nobel. Delhi, 159–175
- Renou, L. (1957): Les divisions dans les textes sanskrits. IJ 1, 1–32
- Renou, L. (1963): Sur le Genre du Sūtra dans la Littérature Sanskrite. JAS 251, 165–216
- Renou, L. (1987): Notes ad Dīgha Nikāya Sutta 1–3. BEI 5, 419–451
- Renou, L./Filliozat, J. (1953): L'Inde Classique. Manuel des Études Indiennes. Hanoi. Tome II
- Reynolds, F. E./Holt, J./Strong, J. (1981): Guide to Buddhist Religion. Boston [rev.: OLZ 1985, 285–287]
- Reynolds, F. E. and M. B. [Trsl.] (1982): Three Worlds according to King Ruang. Berkeley
- Rhys Davids, C. A. F. (1925): The Nettipakaraṇa an Earlier Book than the Paṭṭhāna (Mahāpakaraṇa), JRAS 1925, 111 sq.
- Rhys Davids, T. W. (1901): The Last to go Forth. Jātaka, 4.490=6.30. JRAS, 889-894
- Rhys Davids, T. W./Stede, W. (1921–1924): The Pāli Text Society's Pāli English Dictionary. London

Rogers, T. (1870): *Buddhaghosa's Parables Translated from the Burmese*. London

Rohanadeera, M. (1985): *Mahāsāmi Sangha Rāja Institution in Sri Lanka*. Vidyodaya Journal (Arts, Sciences, Letters) 13.1, 27–43

127, 663 Rohanadeera, M. (1988): *New Evidence on Cultural Relations Between Sri Lanka and the Dvāravati Kingdom of Thailand*. Vidyodaya Journal of Social Science 2. 1/2, 47–63

Roth, G. (1970): *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Patna. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XII

Saddhātissa, H. (1974): *Pāli Literature of Thailand*, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*. Dordrecht, 211–225

Saddhātissa, H. (1976): *The Dawn of Pāli Literature in Thailand*, in: *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*. Colombo, 315–324

Saddhātissa, H. (1979): *Pāli Literature from Laos*, in: *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism. A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*. Delhi, 327–340

Saddhātissa, H. (1980): *Pāli Studies in Cambodia*, in: *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*. London, 242–250

Saddhātissa, H. (1981): *Pāli Literature in Cambodia*. JPTS 11, 178–197

Saddhātissa, H. (1993): *Pāli Literature of South-East Asia*. Singapore (contains Saddhātissa 1974–1981; index: cf. Filliozat 1992)

Y Samtani, N. H. (1964/1965): *The Opening of the Buddhist Sūtras*. Bhārati. Bulletin of the College of Indology. Banaras Hindu University. 8.2, 47–63

X Sarkar, H. B. (1981): *The Date of the Pāli Niddesa and Its Implications for the History of South East Asia*, in: *K. P. Jayaswal Commemoration Volume*. Patna, 207–229

Schalk, P. (1974): *Der Buddhismus aus der Sicht eines buddhistischen Kultus in Śrī Lankā*. Temenos 10, 79–113

Scharfe, H. (1977): *Grammatical Literature. A History of Indian Literature V 2*. Wiesbaden

Schayer, S. (1933): *Studien zur indischen Logik II: Altindische Antizipationen der Aussagenlogik*, in: *O filozofowaniu Hindusów*. Artykuły wybrane. Warsaw 1988, 415–421

Schlingloff, D. (1964): *Zur Interpretation des Prātimokṣasūtra*. ZDMG 113, 563–551

Schlingloff, D. (1985): *König Aśoka und das Wesen des ältesten Buddhismus*. Saeculum 36, 326–332

Schlingloff, D. (1987): *Die Meditation unter dem Jambu-Baum*. WZKS 31, 111–130

Schmithausen, L. (1976): *Die vier Konzentrationen der Aufmerksamkeit. Zur geschichtlichen Entwicklung einer spirituellen Praxis der Buddhisten*.

- Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft 60, 241-266
- Schopen, G. (1991): An Old Inscription from Amarāvati and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries. *JIABS* 14.2, 281-329
- Schopen, G. (1994): Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya. *JIPh* 24, 31-80
- Schrader, F. O. (1905): Die Fragen des Königs Menandros. Berlin
- Schubring, W. (1935): Die Lehre der Jainas. Straßburg
- Schubring, W. (1955): Jinasena, Mallinātha, Kālidāsa. *ZDMG* 105, 331-337 = Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1977, 314-320
- Silva, G. P. S. H. de/ Uragoda, C. G. [Edd.] (1995): Sesquicentennial Commemorative Volume of the Royal Asiatic Society of Sri Lanka 1845-1995. Colombo
- Silva, W. A. de (1938): Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum. Vol. I. Colombo
- v. Simson, G. (1988): Etymologie als Mittel ideologischer Auseinandersetzung: Bemerkungen zum Aggaññasutta des Dīghanikāya, in: *Studia Indoger-manica et Slavica*. Festgabe für W. Thomas. München, 87-98
- Skilling, P. (1981/2): Uddaka Rāmaputta and Rāma, *PBR* 6,2, 99-104
- Skilling, P. (1987): The Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya by Daśabalaśrīmitra. *BSR* 4.1, 3-23
- Skilling, P. (1990): Rev. of Jina-m; Cakkav-d; Loka-p; Loka-d. *BSR* 7, 115-120
- Skilling, P. (1992): The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna. *JPTS* 16, 109-182
- Skilling, P. (1993a): The Citation from the \*Buddhavaṃsa of the Abhayagiri School. *JPTS* 18, 165-175
- Skilling, P. (1993b): Theravāda Literature in Tibetan Translation. *JPTS* 19, 69-201
- Skilling, P. (1993c): A Note of the History of the Bhikkhunī-Saṅgha (I). *Journal of the Office of the Supreme Patriarch's Secretary* 2, no. 5, 39-46 = Skilling 1994b
- Skilling, P. (1993d): A Note on the History of the Bhikkhunī-Saṅgha (II): The Order of Nuns after the Parinirvāṇa, in: *Pāli-Sanskṛta-Vijākār. Mahāma-kuṭarāja Vidyālay* 2436. Bangkok 1993, 208-251 = Skilling 1993/4
- Skilling, P. (1993/4): A Note ... (II). *World Fellowship of Buddhists Review* 30, no.4/31, no.1, 29-49 = Skilling 1993d
- Skilling, P. (1994a): Vimuttimaggā and Abhayagiri: The Form Aggregate According to the Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtaviniścaya. *JPTS* 20, 171-210
- Skilling, P. (1994b): A Note ... (I). *World Fellowship of Buddhists Review* 31, nos 2/3, 47-55 = Skilling 1993c

- Smith, H. (1950): Wilhelm Geiger et le vocabulaire du singalais classique. JAs 238, 177–223
- Somadasa, K. D. (1987/1990/1993): Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library. Vol. I/IV/V. London
- Stache-Rosen, V. (1984): *Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra*. Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin hg. v. H. Bechert. AAWG Nr. 140
- Sternbach, L. (1974): *Subhāṣita, Gnostic and Didactic Literature*. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature IV 1
- Strong, J. (1991): *The Legend and Cult of Upagupta*. Princeton
- Supaphan na Bangchang (1986): *Vivaḍhanākār nān kheiyān bhāṣā pālī nai prahdeś daiy: Cārūk tāpnān baṅśāvatār sāsan prahkās* (The Development of Writing in Pāli in Thailand: Inscriptions, Chronicles, History, Letters, Proclamations) [in Thai]. Bangkok
- Supaphan na Bangchang (1988): A Pāli Letter Sent by the Aggamahāsenāpati of Siam to the Royal Court at Kandy in 1756. JPTS 12, 185–212
- Supaphan na Bangchang (1990 [2533]): *Vivaḍhanākār varṇagatī pālī sāy brah suttantapiṭak dī<sup>1</sup> teen<sup>1</sup> nai prahdeś daiy* (The Development of Pāli Literature Based on the Suttantapiṭaka Composed in Thailand) [in Thai]. Bangkok
- Tanabe, K. (1981): The Sudhana-jātaka in the Paññāsa-jātaka (I). Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū) 10, 99–126
- Tanabe, K. (1983): The Paññāsa-jātaka in the Suddana-jātaka (!) (II). ibidem 13, 105–121
- Tanabe, K. (1991): *Siricūḍāmaṇijātaka of Paññāsa Jātaka*, in: Studies in Buddhism and Culture in Honour of Egaku Mayeda on His 65th Birthday. Tokyo, 267(514)–274(507)
- Taw Sein-Ko (1893): A Preliminary Report of the Kalyani Inscriptions of Dhammacheti, 1476 AD. Bombay
- Terral, G. (1956): *Samuddaghosajātaka*. Conte Pāli Tiré du Paññāsajātaka. BEFEO 48, 249–351
- Terral-Martini, G. (1959): *Velāmajātaka*. BEFEO 49, 609–617
- Than Tun (1959): Religious Buildings of Burma A. D. 1000–1300, JBRS 42,2, 71–80
- Thieme, P. (1972): Lückenbüßer. KZ 86, 20
- Thomas, E. J. (1949): *The Life of the Buddha as Legend and History*. London
- Tieken, H. (1978): A Formal Type of Arrangement in the Vulgata of the Gāthā-saptaśatī. StII 4, 111–130
- Tillemans, T. J. F. (1990): Materials for the Study of Āryadeva, Dharmapāla and Candrakīrti. Wien. Volume I. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 24,1
- Trenckner, V. (1924–1994): A Critical Pāli Dictionary. Copenhagen, Vol. I (1924–1948); II (1960–1990); III, 1–3 (1992–1994)

Tsuchida, R. (1987): Observations on the Language of the *Dīpavaṃsa*. *StII* 13/14, 301–310

Upādhyāy, B. S. (<sup>1</sup>1951; <sup>3</sup>1972): *Pāli Sāhitya kā Itihās. Prayāg*

Vallée Poussin, L. de la (1925): La Controverse du Temps et du *pudgala* dans le *Vijñānakāya*, in: *Études Asiatiques*. Paris, 343–376, repr. in: H. S. Prasad: *Essays on Time in Buddhism*. Delhi 1991, 79–112

Vallée Poussin, L. de la (1932): *Pārāyaṇa Citē dans Jñānaprasthāna*. *Études d' Orientalisme ... à la Mémoire de R. Linossier II*. Paris, 323–327

Vasil'kov, L. V. (1989): O vozmožnosti grečeskogo vlijanija na "Voprosy Milindy" in: *Buddizm. Istorija i Kul'tura*. Moscow, 92–103

Vasil'kov, L. V. (1993): Did East and West Really Meet in Milinda's Questions? *The Petersburg Journal of Cultural Studies* I, 64–77

Vetter, T. (1988): *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*. Leiden

Vetter, T. (1990): Some Remarks on Older Parts of the *Suttanipāṭa*, in: *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference 1987. II. Leiden*, 36–56

Vickery, M. (1991): On *Traibhūmikathā*. *JSS* 79,2, 24–36.

Vogel, C. (1979): *Indian Lexicography*. Wiesbaden. *A History of Indian Literature V 4*

Waldschmidt, E. (1950/1951): *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*. Berlin. Teil I–III. *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* Jg 1949 Nr. 1; Jg 1950 Nr. 2; Jg 1950 Nr. 3

Wang, B. (1994): *Buddhist Nikāyas through Ancient Chinese Eyes*, in: *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*. Göttingen. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden*. Beiheft 5, 166–203

Warder, A. K. (1963): *The Earliest Indian Logic*, in: *Trudy 25go Meždunarodnogo Kongressa Vostokovedov*. Moskva 9–12 Avgusta 1960, Tom IV. Moscow, 56–68

Warder, A. K. (1981): *Some Problems of the Later Pāli Literature*. *JPTS* 9, 198–207

Watanabe, K. (1906/7): *A Chinese Collection of Itivuttakas*. *JPTS*, 44–49

Watanabe, K. (1987): *Some Notes on the Expression 'sabbā-vārā- / sava-vārām'*. *BEI* 5, 375–386

Webb, R. (1993): *É. Lamotte: History of Buddhism (English Translation, Louvain-la-Neuve 1988). An Additional Bibliography*, in: *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte (Bruxelles et Liège 24–27 septembre 1989)*. Louvain-la-Neuve, 161–173

Wezler, A. (1993): *Über Form und Charakter der sogenannten "Polemiken im Staatslehrbuch des Kauṭalya"*. *ZDMG* 143, 106–134

Wijayaratna, M. (1991): *Les moniales bouddhistes. Naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*. Paris

X ~~Willemen, Ch. (1974): *Dharmapada. A Concordance to Udānavarga, Dhammapada, and the Chinese Dharmapada Literature*. Bruxelles. Publications de l'Institut Belge des Hautes Études Bouddhiques. Série "Études et textes" n° 3~~

✓ Windisch, E. (1895): *Māra und Buddha*. Königlich Sächsische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Klasse XV. Leipzig

Winternitz, M. (1912/1933): *Geschichte der indischen Literatur II/1: Die buddhistische Literatur*. Leipzig = *History of Indian Literature* translated from the original German by S. Ketkar and H. Kohn. Calcutta

Winternitz, M. (1920): *Geschichte der indischen Literatur III*. Leipzig

Witzel, M. (1987): *The Case of the Shattered Head*. *StII* 13/14, 363–415

Wüst, W. (1928): *Das Leibesproblem in der buddhistischen Pälilyrik*. *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus* 8, 62–85

Wyatt, D. (1976): *Chronicle Traditions in Thai Historiography*, in: *Southeast Asian History and Historiography. Essays Presented to D. G. E. Hall*. Ithaca and London, 107–122 = A. Wyatt: *Studies in Thai History. Collected Articles*. Chiang Mai 1994, 1–21

Yoshimoto, S. (1995): *On the Sārasaṅgaha*. *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* 24, 125–145 (in Japanese)

Yuyama, A. (1979): *Vinaya-Texte. Systematische Übersicht über die buddhistische Sanskrit-Literatur. A Systematic Survey of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*. Erster Teil. Wiesbaden

Zvelebil, K. (1974): *Tamil Literature. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature X 1*

## XVI. Indices

All numbers refer to paragraphs or footnotes (abbreviated “n.”). Numbers in parentheses refer to bibliographical information preceding the respective paragraph.

### XVI.1 Titles of Pāli Works and Their Sections

Main references are given in bold type; abbreviations: -gp: -gaṇṭhipada; -ja: -jātaka; -s: -suttanta; -ṭ: -ṭīkā.

- Aggañña-s 62  
Aṅguttaranikāya 47, **76–83**, 93,  
119, 178  
Aṅgulimālapīṭaka 437  
Acchariyabbhutaḍḍhamma-s 66, 316  
Aññātakasikkhāpada 223  
Aṭṭhakathā 87 n. 152, 114, 157, 174,  
179, 185, 188, 203, 206, 215sq., 219,  
**225, 227**, 232, 234, 239, **241sq.**,  
245, 249, 255, 261, 293, 303,  
317, 334, 423 n. 704  
Aṭṭhakathāsāra 242  
Aṭṭhakavagga 80 (AN), 94 (Sn),  
97sq. (Sn), 116  
Aṭṭhakesadhātuvamṣa - 195 n. 343  
Aṭṭhānapāli 238  
Aḍḍhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna 427  
Aṭṭhakathākhaṇḍa 134  
Atthayamaka 153  
Atthasālinī 125, 130, 213, 239, 300,  
314, **315**, 316–318  
Atthasālinī-atthayojanā 379  
Atthasālinīmūla-ṭ 356  
Atthuddhārakaṇḍa 134  
Anāgatadasabuddhavamṣa 200  
n. 350  
Anāgatavamṣa (1) 200  
Anāgatavamṣa (2) 448  
Anugaṇṭhipada 368, 377  
Anumānapaṇḍita 177, 179  
Anuruddhavatthu 409 n. 668  
Andhakaaṭṭhakathā 210sq.  
Apadāna **121–123**, 283, 408  
Apalāladamāna 437  
Abhidhamma 37  
Abhidhamma (commentaries) 307,  
340  
Abhidhammagūḷhatthadīpanī 308  
n. 516  
Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (Abhidh-  
av-nt) 343  
Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī (Abhidh-  
s-mhṭ) **346**, 442  
Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-  
atthayojanā (Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y)  
380  
Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha **345**, 442  
Abhidhammatthasaṅgahadīpanī  
(Abhidh-s-nt) 347  
Abhidhammatthasaṅgahasāṅkhepavaṇ-  
ṇanā 344 n. 559, 442 n. 733  
Abhidhammatthasārūpaka 347  
n. 564  
Abhidhammapīṭaka 129–155

- Abhidhammātikatthavaṇṇanā 354  
 Abhidhammamūla-ṭ 369  
 Abhidhammasaṅgaṇī 132  
 Abhidhammāvatāra 247, 340  
 Abhidhammāvatāraporāṇa-ṭ 342  
 Abhidhānapadīpikā 231  
 Abhinīhāradīpaṇī 408a  
 Amatakaravaṇṇanā (245) n. 424  
 Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna 427  
 Ayanavinicchaya 401  
 Ariyapariyesana-s 66  
 Avijahita-ja 432  
 Avidūrenidāna 111, 316  
 Asadisadānavatthu 266, 409  
 Asandhimittāvatthu 409  
 Asitābhū-ja 321 n. 528  
  
 Ākāravattārasutta 436  
 Ākāravattārasuttavaṇṇanā 436  
 Āgamaṭṭhakathā 274, 317  
 Āṭṇāṭṭiya-s 62  
 Ānandabodhi 191  
 Āḷavakagajjita 437  
  
 Itivuttaka 79, 91, 93  
  
 Uttaramāṭupetavatthu 281  
 Uttaraṇṇatthappakāsini (Utt-  
 vn-ṭ) (325)  
 Uttaravinicchaya 325  
 Udāna 91, 89, 169  
 Udenavatthu 269  
 Uparipaṇṇāsa (SN) 69  
 Uparipaṇṇāsa (MN) 63  
 Upālipariṇcchāsūtra 44  
 Upāli-s 68  
 Upāsakajanālamkāra 86, 157,  
 386sq.  
 Uposathakkhandhaka 29  
 Uposathasamyutta 29  
 Urugavagga 94  
 Uruga-s 95  
  
 Ekanipāta (AN) 79  
 Ekādasaguttara 169  
  
 Ekuttara 47, 76  
 Ekuttarika 169  
 Ekottarāgama 47  
  
 Okāsādīpaṇī 398  
 Opammakathāpaṇiha 178sq.  
  
 Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī 15, 28sq., 39,  
 221–225  
 Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī-atthayojanā-ma-  
 hā-ṭ (221)  
 Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī-ṭ 339  
 Kaṅkhāvitarāṇīpātimokkhavaṇ-  
 ṇanā 221  
 Kaṅkhāvitarāṇīporāṇa-ṭ 377  
 Kaccāyanarūpadīpaṇī 379 n. 605  
 Kacchapa-ja 263  
 Kathāvatthu 130, 144–151, 315,  
 448  
 Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-  
 aṭṭhakathā 322  
 Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-ṭ 360  
 Kappiyabhūmīkathā 225  
 Kambojaparājaya (426)  
 Kammaṭṭhāna 326  
 Kammavācā 28, 333  
 Kammavipatti 326  
 Kalingabodhi-ja 191  
 Kukkuravatika-s 68  
 Kuṇāla-ja (109)  
 Kumārapaṇiha 86, 254  
 Kurundī 210sq., 326  
 Kulumba-s 437  
 Kesadhātuvamsa 195 n. 339, 448  
 Kosalabimbavaṇṇanā 271, 427  
 n. 712  
  
 Khaggavisāṇa-s 116  
 Khandhaka 12, 28–39, 217, 325  
 Khandhavagga (SN) 69  
 Khandhasamyutta 69  
 Khuddakagantha 85  
 Khuddakanikāya  
 (structure) 84–128, 85  
 Khuddakanikāya  
 (commentaries) 305–307



- Khuddakapāṭha 86sq., 99, 383  
 Khuddakasikkhā 332sq., 369  
 Khuddakasikkhā-ṭ (332) n. 535, 347  
 Khemappakarāṇa 352
- Gaṇṭhipada 368, 374 (in Sinhalese), 377  
 Gandhavaṃsa 4  
 Guttila-ja 280  
 Guttilavimāna 280  
 Gūlha-Ummagga 270, 437  
 Gūlhatthadīpanī (Vibh-ṭ) 308  
 Gūlha-Vinaya 437  
 Gūlha-Vessantara 270, 437
- Ghoṭamukha-s 65
- Cakkavāla(ttha)dīpanī 400  
 Catudvāra-ja 321 n. 528  
 Catuparivaṭṭa 437  
 Catubhāṇavāraṭṭhakathā 87 n. 152  
 Candasuriyagatidīpanī 401sq.  
 Candasuriyavinicchayappakarāṇa 402  
 Campeyyaka Vinayavatthu 29  
 Campeyyakkhandhaka 29  
 Cariyāpiṭaka 126–128  
 Cāmadevivamsa 426  
 Cittasamyutta 72  
 Cittuppādakaṇḍa 134  
 Cittavibhatti 134  
 Cīvaraviññāpanavatthu 223  
 Cullaniddeśa 116–118  
 Cullavagga (Vin) 30, 217  
 Cūlapaccarī 210  
 Cūlavamsa 187  
 Cūlavagga (Sn) 94  
 Cūlavedalla-s 79
- Chakesadhātuvamsa 195  
 Chagatidīpanī(-ṭ) 394  
 Channovāda-s 66
- Jambudīpuppattivatthu 414  
 Jayamaṅgalagāthā 87 n. 152  
 Jātaka 12, 24, 109–115, 122, 127, 146, 189, 196, 204, 229, 263sq., 267–269, 269 (apocryphal), 270 (apocryphal), 276, 280, 307, 321, 423, 429, 430 (apocryphal), 432, 445, 447 n. 742
- Jātakaṭṭhakathā 261  
 Jātakaṭṭhakathā-ṭ 347  
 Jātakatthayojanā (Burmese text?) 382  
 Jātakatthavaṇṇanā 261  
 Jātaka-pt see Linatthappakāsīnī  
 Jātatthakāṇidāna 423sq., 434, 448  
 Jinakālamālī 199, 428  
 Jinacarita 406  
 Jinabodhāvalī 408a  
 Jinamahānidāna 392  
 Jinālaṃkāra 407  
 Jinālaṃkaravaṇṇanā 407  
 Jīvitavoropanaavatthu 223
- ņānakathā 248  
 ņānaniddeśa 294  
 ņānavibhaṅga 139, 320  
 ņānodaya 207, 248, 314, 448  
 (ņāyagantha) 295, 448
- Tikkhindriya 437  
 Tittira-ja 189  
 Timaṇḍalakathā 432  
 Tirokuḍḍapetavatthu 280  
 Tirokuḍḍa-s 86, 254, 280  
 Tuṇḍilovāda-s 436  
 Temiya-ja 128  
 Telakaṭṭhagāthā 404sq.
- Thūpavaṃsa 189, 192, 297  
 Theragāthā 96, 103–107, 122, 178  
 Therāpadāna 122  
 Therāpadāna 122, 303  
 Therīgāthā 103–108, 122
- Dantadhātuvavaṇṇanā 193  
 Dasa(dāna)vatthuppakarāṇa 409, 412  
 Dasabodhisattaudeśa 201  
 Dasabodhisattavidhi 202  
 Dasabodhisattupattikathā 202

Dasasikkhāpāda 86  
 Dasuttara-s 62, 76 sq., 131, 155, 295  
 Dāṭṭhavaṃsa 193  
 Dānakathā 157  
 Dīghanikāya 52–62  
 Dīghasaṅgīti 226 n. 399  
 Dīpavaṃsa 120, 182, 183sq., 212, 322  
 Dīpavaṃsaṭṭhakathā 183, 206  
 Dūrenidāna 111, 316  
 Dvattiṃsākāra 86, 254, 295, 318  
 \*Dvādasasahassabuddhavaṃsa 125  
 Dvematikāpāli 221 n. 392

Dhajagga-s 74  
 Dhaniya-s 95  
 Dhammanīti 420sq.  
 Dhammapāda 88–90, 169  
 Dhammapāda-ṭ (262)  
 Dhammapādaṭṭhakathā 204, 262–269, 276, 280, 307  
 Dhammapādaṭṭhakathāgāthāyojanā (262)  
 Dhammayamaka 153  
 Dhammasaṅgaṇī 132–136  
 Dhammasaṅgaha 132  
 Dhammasaṅgaha-a 318  
 Dhammasiri-gp 368  
 Dhammahadayaṃvibhaṅga 130, 139  
 Dhātukathā 140  
 Dhātukathā-atthayojanā 380  
 Dhātuvibhaṅga-s 66

Nandopananda 437  
 Narasīhagāthā 111 n. 185  
 Najātadhātuvāṃsa 194  
 Nāgasamyutta 73  
 Nāmacāradīpikā 353  
 Nāmarūpapariccheda 349  
 Nāmarūpasamāsa 352  
 Nālaka-s 97  
 Nikkhepaṇḍa 134  
 Nikkheparāsi 134  
 Nidānakathā (Ja) 111, 125, 128, 261, 300, 303, 316, 432  
 Nidānakathā (Upās) 387

Nidānavagga (SN) 69, 203  
 Niddesa 98, 116–118, 258, 448  
 Nidhikaṇḍa 86, 148, 253sq.  
 Nibbānasutta 436  
 Nettiaṭṭhakathā 362  
 Nettippakaraṇa 84, 156, 158–166, 259, 323  
 Nettippakaraṇa-gp (158) n. 264, 347  
 Nettivibhāvanī (Nett-ṭ) 381

Pāmsukūlādānānisamsakathā 409 n. 671  
 Pāmsukūlānisamsa 409 n. 671  
 Pakiṇṇakakathā (Bv) 124  
 Pakiṇṇakanaya 326  
 Pakiṇṇakanipāta (Ja) 109  
 Paccarī 210  
 Paccekabuddhāpadāna 122, 303  
 Pajjamadhu 403  
 Pañcagatidīpanī 393  
 Pañcappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā 322  
 Pañcappakaraṇamūla-ṭ 356, 360  
 Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa 429  
 Pañcika Atthayojanā 380  
 Pañcūposatha-ja 321 n. 528  
 Paññāvaṃsa 119  
 Paññāsa-ja 270, 429  
 Paṭipattisaṅgaha 386  
 Paṭisambhidāmagga 117–120, 151, 248  
 Paṭisambhidāmagga-a 307  
 Paṭisambhidāmagga-gp 297  
 Paṭṭhāna 154sq., 213  
 Paṭhamasambodhi 391  
 Paṇṇāsaka (Kv) 145  
 Padyapadoruvāṃsagāthā 185, 188  
 Pannavāra 210 n. 379, 448  
 Papañcasūdanī 213, 226–244, 307, 313  
 Pabbajjāvinicchayakathā 334  
 Payogasiddhi 406  
 Paramattha-a 309 n. 518  
 Paramatthajotikā 123, 252–254 (Pj I), 255–259 (Pj II), 274, 278, 280 n. 485 (Pv-a[!]), 287, 295, 307, 447 n. 742  
 Paramatthajotikādīpanī (255)

Paramatthadīpanī (1) 157 (Vv-a),  
 272–285, 292 (Ud-a), 307, 357,  
 360 (Ud-a), 362, 364  
 Paramatthadīpanī (2) (on  
 Abhidhamma) 309 n. 518  
 Paramatthamañjūsā (Vism-  
 mḥ) 361, 366  
 Paramatthavinicchaya 348  
 Paramatthavibhāvanī (Pv-a) 280  
 n. 485  
 Paritta 62, 87, 383  
 Parivāra 40–42, 133, 166, 211, 323,  
 325  
 Pavāraṇakkhandhaka 74  
 Pācittiya 216, 220, 241  
 Pācityādiyojanā 419 n. 694  
 Pāṭikavagga (DN) 52  
 Pātimokkha-s 15–21, 98, 221sq.,  
 Pārājika 214–216  
 Pārājikakaṇḍa 215  
 Pārāyaṇavagga 94, 98, 116  
 Pārūpanapāli 419 n. 693  
 Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśa-  
 gaha 157 n. 263, 334sq., 339,  
 372  
 Piṭakaṭṭ-samuṇ 4, 154sq.  
 Piṭakattayakāraṇisaṃsa 409  
 n. 671  
 Piṭakattayalakkaṇa 4 n. 10  
 Piṭakamālā 4 n. 10  
 Puggalapaññatti 141–143  
 Pucchāyamaka 153  
 Pubbakammapiḷoti 123  
 Pubbayoga 175  
 Peṭaka 171, 362, 448  
 Peṭakālamkāra (Nett-mḥ) 382  
 Peṭakopadesa 84, 167–171, 323  
 Petavatthu 100–102  
 Porāṇagaṇṭhipada 368, 377  
 Porāṇa-ṭ 337  
 Porāṇaṭṭhakathā 221  
 Phussadevattheravatthu 415  
 Bakkula-s 65  
 Bandhanāgāra-ja 267

Bandhanāgāravatthu 267  
 Bahubhāṇi-ja 263  
 Bāhirakathā 175 n. 295  
 Bāhiraṇidānakathā 212, 220  
 Buddhaghosaṇidānakathā 190  
 Buddhaghosupatti 207  
 Buddhavaṃsa 124sq., 189, 432  
 Buddhavaṃsasamvaṇṇanā 298  
 Buddhāpadāna 122  
 Bodhivaṃsa *see* Mahābodhivaṃsa  
 Buddhāpadānīya Dhammapariyāya  
 (Cp) 126, 128  
 Brahmasamyutta 74  
 Bhūtagāmaavagga 223  
 Bhaddekaratta-s 64  
 Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga 27, 216  
 Bhesajakkhandhaka 225  
 Maṅgalatthadīpanī 389  
 Maṅgala-s 86, 95, 253, 257, 389  
 Macchamaṃsavinicchayaṇakathā 334  
 Majjhimaṭṭhakathā 227  
 Majjhimanikāya 63–68, 96  
 Majjhimaṇṇāsā (SN) 69  
 Majjhimaṇṇāsā (MN) 63  
 Majjhimasāṅgīti 226 n. 398  
 Maṇidīpa 308 n. 513  
 Maṇisāramañjūsā (158) n. 264, 261,  
 (332) n. 535, 336, 347, 351, 359  
 Madhukosa 450  
 Madhu-ṭ 308 n. 513  
 Madhuratthappakāsinī (Bv-a) 298  
 Madhuratthappakāsinī (Mil-ṭ) 180  
 Madhuratthavilāsinī (Bv-a)  
 302–304, 307  
 Madhuratthasārasandīpanī 343  
 Madhurasavāhinī *see* Rasavāhinī  
 Madhura-s 65  
 Madhusāratthadīpanī 308 n. 513  
 Manussaviggaha 223  
 Manussavinayavaṇṇanā 424  
 Manussavinēyya 424  
 Manorathapūraṇī 226–244, 307,  
 313  
 Mallikādevīvatthu 280

Mallikāvimāna 280  
 Mahāatṭhakathā 210  
 Mahāgaṇṭhipada 337  
 Mahāgovinda-ja 109  
 Mahādibbamaṇṇa 87 n. 152  
 Mahādhammahadaya 130, 448  
 Mahānāgakulasandesa 441  
 Mahānidāna-s 59  
 Mahānidessa 116–118  
 Mahānipāta (Ja) 109  
 Mahāpakaraṇa 154  
 Mahāpaccaṇṇi 210, 218, 225, 263  
 Mahāpaṇṇāsa (MN) 63  
 Mahāpadāna-s 59, 237  
 Mahāparinibbāna-s 32, 80  
 Mahābodhivaṃsa 191  
 Mahābodhivaṃsakathā 191, 448  
 Mahārahanīti 420sq.  
 Mahāvamsa 182, 185–187, 191,  
 193, 207, 212, 376 n. 600,  
 409sq., 448  
 Mahāvamsa (Extended) 189  
 Mahāvagga 30 (Vin), 52 (DN), 69  
 (SN), 94 (Sn), 119 (Paṭi), 217 (Vin)  
 Mahāvāra 186  
 Mahāsaccaka-s 66  
 Mahāvivijaya-ja 431  
 Mahāsoṇattheravatthu 320  
 Mātikāatṭhakathā 221 n. 393, 358  
 n. 575  
 Mātugāmasaṃyutta 73  
 Māleyyattheravatthu 435  
 Milindapañha 84, 105, 130, 169,  
 172–180, 190, 317, 447 n. 742  
 Munigāthā 92  
 Muni-s 97  
 Mūgapakkhā-ja 128  
 Mūla-ṭ 357, 439  
 Mūlapaṇṇāsa (SN) 69  
 Mūlasikkhā 332sq.  
 Meṇḍadakapañha 176sq., 179  
 Meṇḍakamilindapañha 179, 437  
 n. 723  
 Metta-s 86, 95  
 Moneyya-s 97  
 Mohavicchedanī 324 n. 529, 336sq.,  
 354

Yamaka 152sq.  
 Yuganandhavagga 119  
  
 Ratṭhapālagajjita 437  
 Ratṭhapāla-s 23, 67  
 Ratanabimbavaṇṇanā 427  
 Ratana-s 86, 95  
 Rasavāhinī 198, 404sq., 410, 412,  
 413–415, 418  
 Rājanīti 420sq.  
 Rūpakaṇḍa 134  
 Rūpavibhatti 134  
 Rūpārūpavibhāga 340  
 Revatīvimānavāṇṇanā 157  
  
 Lakkhaṇagantha 344  
 Lakkhaṇa-s 62  
 Līnatthajotikā 356, 358, 360  
 Līnatthadīpanī-ṭ (Paṭi-ṭ) 297, 448  
 Līnatthapadavaṇṇanā 356  
 Līnatthappakāsinī (1) (Kkh-ṭ) 358  
 n. 575, 378  
 Līnatthappakāsinī (2) (Ja-pt) 261,  
 359  
 Līnatthappakāsinī (3) (Sv-pt, Ps-pt,  
 Spk-pt, Nett-pt) 358–360, 362  
 Līnatthavaṇṇanā (1) (As-anuṭ, Vibh-  
 anuṭ, Ppk-anuṭ) 360  
 Līnatthavaṇṇanā (2) (Nett-pt) 360,  
 363  
 Līnatthasāradīpanī 373  
 Līnapadavikāsaka (Kkh-pt) 377  
 Lokanīti (1) 420sq.  
 Lokanīti (2) 421  
 Lokaneyya(navakaṇḍapāli) 423  
 Lokapañṇatti 394, 395sq., 397sq.  
 Loka(ppa)dīpakasāra 397sq.  
  
 Vamsatthappakāsinī (Mhv-ṭ) 188,  
 410sq., 448  
 Vamsamālīnī 190  
 Vamsamāvilāsīnī 190  
 Vaṅṅisaṃyutta 74, 95  
 Vaṅṅisa-s 96  
 Vajirabuddhi-ṭ 339, 367–371  
 Vaṭṭaṅgulirāja-ja 271

- Vaṇṇapiṭaka 437  
 Vāseṭṭha-s 95  
 Vinayakamma 326  
 Vinayagaṇṭhipada 367  
 Vinayatthamañjūsā (Kkh-ṭ) 378  
 Vinayatthamañjūsā  
     Līnatthappakkāsānī  
     Mātikatṭhakathā 378  
 Vinayatthasārasandīpanī (Vin-vn-  
     pt) 330  
 Vinayapiṭaka 12–45, 131, 209  
     n. 377 (Chinese trsl.),  
     333–335, 339  
 Vinayavinicchaya 325, 333, 339  
 Vinayavinicchaya-pt 330, 339, 347  
 Vinayavibhaṅga 98  
 Vinayasamgaha *see*  
     Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya  
 Vinayasamgaha-pt (Pālim-pt) 336,  
     347  
 Vinayālamkāra-ṭ (Pālim-nt) 336  
 Vibhaṅga 138sq.  
 Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathāatthayojanā 379  
 Vibhaṅgamūla-ṭ 356  
 Vimalatthavilāsinī (Vv-a) 300  
 Vimativinodanī 324 n. 529, 337,  
     338, 339  
 Vimānavatthu 100–102  
 Vimuttimaggā 120, 245–250  
 Visuddhajanavilāsinī (Ap-a) 307  
 Visuddhimaggā 120, 171, 188, 203,  
     213, 219sq., 226, 242, 244,  
     245–250, 254, 257, 290, 292, 295,  
     312, 318, 323, 341, 361, 448  
 Visuddhimaggā-gp (245)  
 Visuddhimaggā-culla-ṭ (245)  
 Visuddhimaggadīpikā (245) n. 425  
 Visuddhimaggā-mahā-ṭ *see*  
     Paramatthamañjūsā  
 Vedallapiṭaka 437  
 Vemattakathā 432  
 Verañjakaṇḍa 220  
 Verañjakathā 213, 219sq.  
 Velāma-ja 109, 270 n. 471, 321  
 Vessantaradīpanī 390  
 Vessantara-ja 109, 115, 321, 435  
 Saṃyuttaka 169  
 Saṃyuttatṭhakathā 227  
 Saṃyuttanikāya 69–75, 219, 436  
 Sakkapañña-s 57, 61  
 Sagāthavagga (SN) 69, 74, 92, 96,  
     113, 230  
 Saṃkhepaatṭhakathā 210, 215, 220  
 Saṃkhepavaṇṇanā 442  
 Saṃkhyāpakāsaka(-ṭ) 390  
 Saṅgītivamsa 199, 425, 428  
 Saṅgīti-s 62, 155, 295  
 Saṃghabhedakkhandhaka 36, 325  
 Saṃghādisesa 216, 333  
 Saccasaṅkhepa 351, 366  
 Satipaṭṭhāna-s 72  
 (Saddagantha) 295, 448  
 Saddanīti 297  
 Saddalakkhaṇa 413 n. 687  
 Saddhammapakāsīnī (Paṭis-a) 287,  
     291–297, 307  
 Saddhammapakāsīnī-gp 297  
 Saddhammapajjotikā (Nidd-  
     a) 287–290, 292, 296, 307, 448  
 Saddhammasaṅgha 4, 351  
 Saddhammopāyana 439  
 Santikenidāna 111  
 Sandesakathā 442  
 Samathakkhandhaka 67  
 Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā 198, 413  
 Samantapāsādikā 183, 188, 207,  
     208–220, 241sq., 249, 261,  
     263, 279, 317, 326, 333sq., 339,  
     437  
 Samantapāsādikā (Chin.) 45, 207  
 Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā 379  
 Samuddaghosa-ja 270 n. 471  
 Sammohavinodanī (Vibh-a) 279,  
     292, 318, 319–321  
 Saḷāyatanavagga (SN) 69, 73  
 Sahassavatthuattṭhakathā 410  
 Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa 410,  
     414sq., 418  
 Sādhucaritodaya 408  
 Sādhū(jana)vīlāsinī (Sv-nt) 382, 450  
 Sāmagāma-s 67  
 Sāma-ja (109)  
 Sāmaññaphala-s 57

- Sāratthadīpanī (Sp-ṭ) 339, 373, 385  
 Sāratthappakāsinī 219, 226–244,  
 307, 313  
 Sāratthamañjūsā (Mp-pt) 357, 375  
 Sāra(ttha)saṅgaha 384sq.  
 Sāratthasamuccaya 87 n. 152  
 Sārasamāsa 448  
 Sāliṛājakumāravatthu 410, 415  
 Sāsanavaṃsa 4  
 Siṅgālovāda-s 62  
 Siddhatthateladāyikārājaputtivatthu 432  
 Siricūḍamaṇi-ja 270 n. 471  
 Sivijaya-ja 431  
 Sivijayaṇṇa 431  
 Sihiṅgabuddharūpanidāna 427  
 Sīmālamkāra 339  
 Sīmālamkārasaṅgaha 339  
 Sīmāvivādavinicchayakathā 339,  
 438 n. 726  
 Siṭṭakhandhavagga (DN) 52, 382  
 Siḥaḷaṭṭhakathā 182, 206, 212, 221,  
 231, 410 (°naya)  
 Siḥaḷaṭṭhakathāmahāvaṃsa 185,  
 410  
 Siḥaḷaḍḍipuppattivatthu 414  
 Siḥaḷamātikaṭṭhakathā 221, 225  
 Siḥaḷavatthuppakaraṇa 416–418  
 Suttaniddesa (=Niddesa) 116  
 Suttanipāta 94–99  
 Suttapiṭaka 46–128  
 Suttavibhaṅga 12, 22–27, 116, 222  
 Suttasaṅgaha 84, 156, 157, 383  
 Sudhanakumāra-ja 270 n. 471  
 Sumaṅgalavilāsinī 213, 226–244,  
 277sq., 307, 313  
 Sumatāvātāra 340, 448  
 Sumanāvātāra 340 n. 552  
 Sumedhapañḍita-ja 109  
 Sūkarapotikāvatthu 265  
 Sekkhiya 216, 333  
 Senāsanavagga 223  
 Sela-s 96  
 Sotatthakīnidāna 432sq.  
 Hatthavanagallavihāraṃsa 196

## XVI.2 Authors

Titles used instead of personal names are given in parentheses.

- (Aggamahāsenāpati) 413  
 Aggavaṃsa 297  
 Anantañña 420  
 Anuruddha 344sq., 348–350  
 Ariyavaṃsa (1) 157 n. 261  
 Ariyavaṃsa (2) 427  
 Ariyavaṃsa (3)  
 (dhammasenāpati) 347  
 Ānanda (1) 324 n. 529, 343 n. 555,  
 351, 355sq., 366, 368–370  
 Ānanda (2) (Upās) 386sq.  
 Ānanda (3)  
 Abhayagirikavicakravartī 439  
 Ānanda (4) Araññaratana/  
 Vanaratana 343 n. 555, 403, 413  
 Ānada (5) 308 n. 513  
 Uttamaṅga 402  
 Upatissa (1) (Mhvb) 191  
 Upatissa (2) (Vim) 245  
 Upasena 287–290, 305–307  
 Kaccāna *see* Mahākaccāna  
 Kassapa (1) (of  
 Arimaddanapura) 441  
 Kassapa (2) Coḷa 200, 324 n. 529,  
 338, 354  
 Khema 352  
 Gaṇāmiṣsa 420  
 Culla-Dhammapāla *see* Dhammapāla  
 Culla-Buddhaghosa *see* Buddhaghosa

- Cūḷābhayaṭṭhara 180  
 259–261, 274, 276, 290, 300,  
 305–307, 312, 324, 327, 331,  
 340, 357, 365, 371, 432  
 (Culla°), 433, 448
- Chapaṭa 442, 353 n. 569
- Jāgara 419 n. 694  
 Buddhadatta (1) (Bv) 298  
 Buddhadatta (2) 324–331  
 Buddhanāga 377sq.  
 Buddhapiya 403  
 Buddharakkhita 407  
 Bodhiramsi 426sq.  
 Brahmarājapañña 427
- Ñānakitti 324 n. 529, 379sq.  
 Nānavilāsa 390  
 Nāpābhivamsa Dhammasenāpati  
 Dhammarājādhirājaguru 382,  
 442
- Ñānāloka 419 n. 692  
 Ñeyyadhamma 339
- Tipiṭakālaṅkāra 337
- Dīpa 40  
 Devarakkhita Jayabāhu  
 Dhammakitti 408a
- Dhammakitti (1) 4  
 Dhammakitti (2) 182, 188, 376  
 n. 600  
 Dhammakitti (3) 193, 376  
 Dhammakitti (4) 408a  
 Dhammanandi 418  
 Dhammapāla 85, 128, 247, 251  
 n. 441, 254, 259sq., 272, 286,  
 288–290, 296, 299–301,  
 305–307, 343 n. 555, 351,  
 355–363, 364–366, 366 (Culla°),  
 370, 419
- Dhammasiri 368–370
- Nandācariya 385 n. 620  
 Nāgasena (1) (of  
 Mahānāgākula) 441  
 Nāgasena (2)  
 (Kuṇḍalakesivatthu) 338, 449
- Paññāsāmī 4  
 Paṇḍita, Baṭuvantudave 182
- Buddhaghosa 164, 185, 203, 207sq.,  
 220, 224, 244, 251, 254,  
 259–261, 274, 276, 290, 300,  
 305–307, 312, 324, 327, 331,  
 340, 357, 365, 371, 432  
 (Culla°), 433, 448
- Mañ<sup>3</sup> Kṛi<sup>3</sup> Mahāsiriyejyasū 4  
 Mahākaccāna 159sq., 170  
 Mahānāma (1) (Paṭis-a) 291, 296,  
 305–307  
 Mahānāma (2) (Mhv) 182, 185  
 Mahānāma (3) 308 n. 513  
 Mahāmaṅgala 207 n. 369  
 (Mahāsāmī) 332  
 Medhakkara (1) 397  
 Medhakkara (2) 406  
 Moggallāna 189
- Raṭṭhapāla 410  
 (Ratanapañña) 428
- Vajirabuddhi 209sq., 356, 367–371,  
 374  
 Vanaratana Vimaladhamma 199  
 Varasambodhi (262)  
 Vācissara 192, 297, 339, 342  
 Vimaladhamma 199  
 Vedeha 198, 410, 413
- Saddhammapāla 381  
 Saddhammajotipāla 353  
 Sambadhapaḷa (or:  
 Samantapāla) 381 n. 611  
 Sāriputta (1) 155 (Paṭṭh), 287  
 (Nidd), 291 (Paṭis)  
 Sāriputta (2) 193, 330, 334, 338, 343,  
 363, 372–377, 378, 406  
 Siddhattha 385  
 Sirimaṅgala 389sq., 400

Sirisumaṅgala (262)  
 Sīlācāra 347  
 Sumaṅgala (1) 330, 343, 346, 373  
 Sumaṅgala (2a) Araññavāsin 330,  
 343, 346, 373  
 Sumaṅgala (2b) (of the  
 Nandipariveṇa) 343, 406

Sumaṅgala (3) (of Jambuddoṇi  
 monastery) 406  
 Sumaṅgala (4), Tibboṭṭuvāve 182  
 Sumaṅgala (5), Hikkaduve Sṛī 182  
 Sumati 343  
 Sumedha 408  
 Suvaṇṇaramsi 391

### XVI.3 Pāli Words

aṅga (1) 10, 83  
 aṅga (2) 223 (in Kkh)  
 ajjhesana 208  
 aṭṭhakathā 203  
 aṭṭhakathāmuttaka 218 n. 389, 312  
 aṭṭhavaṇṇanāya mātikā 252  
 aṭṭhuppattika 230  
 attavattthu 112  
 attite 113, 269  
 attano mati 230  
 attha 159  
 atthajjhāsaya 230  
 atthayojanā 203, 379  
 attharaṇa 232  
 atthuppatti 254  
 adinnādāna 18  
 adhikaraṇasamatha 16  
 adhigamananidāna 316  
 anāpatti 24, 37  
 aniyata 16  
 anugīti 169  
 anuttānapadavaṇṇanā 188, 214  
 n. 384, 231  
 anutthera 373  
 anupaññatti 22  
 anyimāna 230  
 anusandhi 11, 264  
 antaradhāna 85 n. 150  
 aparāpariyavedaniyāpākamma 432  
 apubba(pada)vaṇṇanā 214, 230,  
 256, 293  
 abuddhavadāna 437  
 abbhutadhamma 10  
 abhidhamma 129, 315

abhinīhāra 126  
 abhisamaya 293  
 arañña 232  
 ahimsā 18  
 āgama 47, 226  
 āgamaṭṭhakathā 274, 317  
 ācariyavāda 183, 230  
 ājīva 387  
 ānāpānasati 295  
 ānisaṃsa 409, 435  
 āpatti 80  
 āpattivinicchaya 216

iti/nāma 249, 261  
 iti pi so 74  
 isisattama 286

uddāna 103  
 uddānagāthā 169  
 uddesa 64  
 uddesavāra 159  
 upasampadā 31, 215, 224  
 upāsaka 386  
 uposatha 15, 224, 286  
 uppatti 256

ekamsika 419 n. 693, 442  
 evaṃ anusuyyate 416sq.  
 evaṃ me sutam 33, 53, 195, 202,  
 230, 238, 257, 277  
 evaṃ etaṃ bhūtapubbam 54, 236



otappa 261 n. 460

kaṭhina 224

kaṇḍa 395, 400

kathā 119 (Paṭis), 392, 432

kathāsaṅghanaya 384

kappa 201

kappati ... kappo 38

kabaḷaggaha 450 n. 750

kabba 81 n. 147

kāmadhātu 295

keci 232

gaṅgāvālikopama 304

gaṇṭhipada(vivaraṇa) 203

garudhamma 80, 241

gāthā 112, 261

gihivinaya 62, 386

gūḷhaṭṭhadīpanī 203

geyya 10

cakkanakkhatta 402

cīvara 215, 224

cora 320

jotisattha 330

ñāṇa 119

ñāyagantha 295, 448

ṭikā 203, 355

ṭhānāniyama 384 n. 608

ṭhitapāḷivasena 215

taṃ yathā 'nusūyate 174

tathāgata 277, 288

tāpasa 257

tipiṭaka 10, 11

tipiṭakamahāthera 402

dāna 436

dīpanā 312

dīpāgamana 184

desanānidāna 315

dhamma 10, 203

dhammakathikā 79

dhammakkhanda 11

dhammadhara 131

dhammasaṅgāhaka 230

dhātu 140

dhutaḡaṇa 177, 354

dhutadharaggasamāna 354

naya 159

nayaggāha 230

narindāgamana 184

nāma/iti 249, 261

nikāya 47, 252

nikāyantaraladdhi 310

nikkhepakāraṇa 254

nikkhepayojana 254

nigamana 207, 247, 261, 274, 287,  
291, 297, 302, 327, 334, 345,  
358, 373, 375, 378–380, 382, 386,  
395, 413, 433

nidāna 133, 230, 281 n. 489, 316

(Abhidhamma)

niddesa 166 n. 199, 287

niddesavāra 159

nipāta 77 (AN), 92 (It), 103sq. (Th),  
109 (Ja)

nibbāna 177, 436 (compared to a  
city)

nirutti 292

nissaggiya 16, 21

nissaya 203

netti 158

pakarāṇa 247, 340

pakiṇṇaka 114, 124, 218, 230, 283,  
285

paccattharaṇa 232

paccuppannavatthu 112

paññatti 22 (Vin), 141 (Pp)

paṭiccasamuppāda 59

paṭisaṃbhidā 119, 292

pada 159

padabhājanīya 22

pabbajjā 31

parajjhāsaya 230

- pariccheda 185 (Mhv), 189  
 (ExtMhv), 199 (Sgv), 235 (of  
 the life of the Buddha), 351  
 (Sacc), 353 (Nāmac), 387 (Upās),  
 391 (Paṭham), 397 (Loka-d),  
 426 (Cdv)  
 pariyattipamāṇa 255  
 pavāraṇā 74  
 pācittiya 16  
 pāṭidesaniya 16  
 pāṇātipāta 18  
 pāramī 126, 285  
 pārājika 16, 17, 19, 20, 23  
 pārisajja 74  
 pāli 203, 255  
 pālimuttaka 218, 312, 334  
 puggala 141, 145  
 pucchāvasika 230, 299  
 puññapothhaka 187  
 purāṇasabrahmacārin 66  
 peta 101  
  
 buddhavadana 10, 103, 124, 133,  
 144 (see also a°)  
 bodhipariccheda 235  
  
 bhagavā 230 n. 407  
 bhāṇaka 49, 85, 226, 228, 249, 267  
 bhāṇavāra 12 n. 29, 30, 48 n. 91, 70,  
 152, 154, 183, 185 n. 322, 227,  
 237, 255, 274, 311  
 bhikkhu 13, 224, 225  
 bhikkhunī 13  
 bhūtapubba 113  
 bhūmi 167, 170  
  
 matthaluṇḍa 318  
 malānabhāsā 392  
 mahatṭhakathā 317  
 mahādhammarājaguru 381  
 mahāpadesa 9 (Sutta), 230 (Vin)  
 mahālekha 287  
 mahāsāmin 378  
 mahāsāvaka 283  
 māṇava 231, 283  
 mātāpituupaṭṭhāna 389  
  
 mātikā 10, 15, 54, 70 n. 132, 119  
 (Paṭis), 131, 133–135, 138–142,  
 144sq., 153sq., 178, 247, 252,  
 256, 333, 354, 384  
 mulakkhara 392  
 musāvāda 18  
 mūlapada 159  
 mūlasaṅgīti 164  
 methunadhamma 18, 216  
  
 yamaka 153  
  
 rakkhā 62  
 rājavamṣa 184  
  
 lekha 438  
 lokadhātu 318 n. 527  
  
 vaṃsa 181, 184  
 vagga 69(SN), 77 n. 142, 89 (Dhp),  
 91 (Ud), 93 (It), 95 (Sn), 411 (Sah),  
 414 (Ras)  
 vaṇṇanā 336  
 vatthu 22 (Vin), 216 (Vin), 100 (Vv,  
 Pv), 223 n. 396 (Kkh, Sp), 263  
 (Dhp-a), 320 (Vibh-a), 409  
 (Dasav), 411 (Sah), 415 (Ras), 416  
 (Sīh)  
 vāra 166  
 vinaya 10  
 vinayadhara 49 n. 92, 131  
 vinayavatthu 29  
 vinicchaya 208  
 vinītavatthu 22  
 vibhaṅga 64, 138  
 vibhāga 159  
 vimāna 101  
 viharati 230 n. 407  
 vuttaṃ hetam bhagavatā 93  
 veyyākaraṇa 10, 54, 70 n. 131, 112  
 (Ja), 261 (Ja)  
 vo “you” (explained) 231  
 vohāra 203  
 vyañjana 159  
  
 saṃsāramocaka 365 n. 579  
 saṃyutta 29

- saṅkhepa 190  
 saṅgahagāthā 347 n. 564  
 saṅgahavāra 159  
 saṅgīti 226 n. 398  
 saṅgītikāra 95  
 saṃgha 13  
 saṃghatthera 227 n. 401  
 saṃghaparināyaka 372  
 saṅgharāja 382  
 saṃghādisesa 16, 23  
 saddagantha 295, 448  
 sandesa 339  
 sabbato pabbhaṃ 232 n. 412  
 sabhādhīpati 408  
 samuṭṭhāna 218  
 samodhāna 112  
 sambahula 232 n. 412, 257 n. 452,  
 286  
 saraṇagamana 387  
 sāsanāgamana 184  
 sikkhāpāda 20, 239  
 siratṭhimālapālaka 381 n. 614  
 sīmā 224, 339, 371, 446  
 sīla (pañca) 20, 319, 387  
 suñña 295  
 sutta (1) 10, 230  
 sutta (2) ("thread", Nett) 159  
 sutta (3) (= Pātimokkhasutta) 20,  
 37  
 suttanikkhepa 230, 254, 256, 278,  
 299  
 suttanta 46 n. 89, 70 n. 131  
 suttantarāja 237  
 suttavebhaṅgī 170  
 suttānuloma 230  
 subhāsita 74  
 sekkhiya 16  
 soṇḍasahāya 249  
 soḷasaparivāra 41  
 hāra 159sq.  
 hiri 262 n. 460

## XVI.4 General Index

- abbreviated text *see* skeleton text  
 Abhayagirivihāra 43, 125, 184, 186,  
 188, 250, 439, 447  
 Abhayagiri-Vinaya 43  
 Abhinavapura 379  
 Acutavikkanta (king) 329  
 Adam's Peak 198  
 additions (later to the canon) 65  
 (MN), 102 (Pv), 106 (Th/Thī),  
 236 (DN), 281sq. (Vv, Pv)  
 Ādittarāja (king) 426  
 Aggabodhi I. (king) 288 n. 496, 306  
 Ajātasattu 236  
 ākhyāna 183sq., 268  
 ākhyāna theory 113  
 alaṃkāra 107  
 Ājāra Kālāma 66  
 Amarapura 382  
 Ambapālī 108  
 Ānanda 228, 310  
 Anantasuti (minister, initiator) 381  
 Anāthapiṇḍika 111  
 Anavataptagāthā 123  
 Andhakapotthaka 371  
 anonymous literature 49  
 Anurādhapura 191sq.  
 Anuruddha 228  
 Anuruddhaśataka 350  
 apocryphal texts 437, 447  
 Arimaddaka (°na) (city) 327, 353,  
 441  
 arrangement of text (numerical) 104  
 Arthavargiya-s 97  
 ascetic practices 68  
 Aśoka 86 n. 151 (Bairāṭ), 97  
 (Bairāṭ), 144, 395, 409  
 Assaghosa 394  
 astrology 330  
 asura 74  
 Aśvaghosa 394  
 Atthadassī (initiator) 261  
 Aṭṭhakathācariya 236

- autocommentary 336 (on Pālim),  
     363 (on Nett-a)  
 Ava 336  
 Avadāna 36, 196  
 Ayutthaya 199, 392, 443
- Badaratiṭṭhavihāra 274  
 Bakkula 65  
 Bāṇa 197  
 Bangkok 199  
 Baudhāyana 18 n. 37  
 Benares 270  
 Bhaggava (teacher of the  
     Bodhisatta) 286  
 Bhāṇu, Vāṇija (initiator) 330  
 Bhāratayuddha 449  
 Bhārhuṭ 112 n. 187  
 Bhartṛhari 365  
 Bhokkanta (village) 265  
 Bhūtamaṅgala (village) 328  
 bibliographies 3 n. 4  
 Bimbisāra (king) 271  
 biography of the Buddha 66, 95,  
     111, 235, 284, 391sq.  
 Bodawpaya (king) 382  
 Bodh Gayā 207  
 Bodhi trees (of former  
     Buddhas) 408a, 432  
 Bodhisatta (reborn as a woman) 432  
 Bodhisattas (10 former) 432  
 Brāhmaṇa (Vedic text) 32, 60  
 Buddha (his daily routine) 239  
 Buddha (visits Ceylon) 198  
 Buddha (visits Siam) 429  
 Buddha images (history of) 425, 427  
 Buddhādāsa (king) 206  
 Buddhadeva (initiator) 261  
 Buddhaghosa (initiator) 312  
 Buddhāmitta (1) (initiator) 227 (Ps),  
     261 (Ja)  
 Buddhāmitta (2) 208 (Sp)  
 Buddhāmitta (3) Coḷa (initiator) 330  
 Buddhāmitta (4) (quoted by  
     Vajirabuddhi) 368  
 Buddhapiya 338, 385  
 Buddhasiṅha (1) (initiator) 298 (Bv-  
     a), 328 (Vin-vn)
- Buddhasiṅha (2) Saddhammaratana  
     (initiator) 298 (Bv-a)  
 Buddhasiri (1) (initiator) 208  
 Buddhasiri (2) (inscription of) 404  
 Buddhasoma 440  
 Buddhist Text Information 5  
 Burma 339
- Cāmadevī (queen) 426  
 Candra (grammarian) 304  
 Candragomin 439  
 catalogues of manuscripts 6 n. 14  
 Channa 66  
 Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Edition 5  
 Chiang Mai 199, 270, 379, 389sq.,  
     400, 426, 428  
 chronology (traditional of  
     Suttantas) 57  
 chronology of Abhidhamma  
     texts 151  
 chronology of  
     commentaries 305–307  
 chronology of  
     subcommentaries 368–370  
 Citta 72  
 Coḷakulindakapariveṇa 378  
 commentaries (chronology  
     of) 305–307  
 commentaries (of Vin lost) 448  
 commentary 15, 26, 98, 116, 147,  
     203  
 composition of a book (time needed  
     for) 209 (Sp), 346 (Abhidh-a-  
     mht), 379 (As-y)  
 concatenation 21, 104  
 contents of Tipiṭaka, Nikāya 212,  
     252  
 corpse preserved in oil 81  
 councils 8, 31, 38, 62, 65, 102,  
     106, 120, 140, 144, 164, 183sq., 206,  
     228, 236, 281sq., 310, 428, 437  
 cremation of queen Mallikā 81  
 cross references within the  
     commentaries 243, 263,  
     276sq., 289  
 cross references within the  
     Tipiṭaka 72, 80, 98

- Damiḷa 195  
 Damiḷarattḥa 338  
 Daśabalaśrimitra 250  
 Daśabhāṇavāra-Vinaya 37 n. 71  
 Daśādhyaya-Vinaya 37 n. 71  
 Dāṭhanāga (1) (initiator) 227 (Sv)  
 Dāṭhanāga (2) of  
     Siddhagāmapariveṇa  
     (initiator) 361, 365 n. 580  
 dating of Sinhalese kings 182 n. 308  
 debates 56sq., 59  
 decades (text division) 21 (Pāt), 30  
     (Vin), 62 (DN), 63 (MN), 69 (SN),  
     77 (AN), 92 (It), 119 (Paṭis), 122  
     (Ap), 219 (Vin), 270 (Paññāsa-ja),  
     411 (Sah), 414 (Ras), 416 (Sih)  
 Deva (initiator) 287  
 Dhammaceti (king) 446  
 Dhammadinnā 79  
 Dhammakapabbata  
     (monastery) 347  
 Dhammakitti Paṇḍita, Upāsaka  
     (initiator) 330  
 Dhammamitta (initiator) 356  
 Dhammarakkhita (initiator) 362  
 Dhammāsokārāma 362  
 Dhampiya aṭuvā gāṭapadaya 206  
     n. 362, (262)  
 Dhaniya 95  
 Dharmapāla 272 n. 474  
 Dharmapradīpikā 386  
 Dharmasāstra 16 n. 39, 319  
 dialogue (formalized) 55  
 dictionary (kośa) 231, 293, 320, 450  
 digression 217sq.  
 Dīpaṃkara 111, 124, 316, 392,  
     406sq.  
 Dīpaṃkaravastu (Mv) 125 n. 220  
 disappearance of the sāsaṇa 85, 318  
     n. 527  
 Divyāvadāna 97sq., 270, 395  
 Duñ Yañ 429  
 Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (king) 186, 192, 265,  
     410  
 earthquakes 60  
 editions of the Tipiṭaka 5, 419  
     n. 695, 446  
 ekamsaka controversy 419 n. 693,  
     442  
 Elāra (king) 186  
 end of Suttanta (formalized) 54  
 epics 114, 186  
 exchange of texts (Suttanta >  
     Vinaya) 34  
 expanded text *see* skeleton text  
 explanation of words in the  
     commentaries 231–235  
 formulas 117, 131, 136  
 Gaing-ok Kyaung (monastery) 401  
 Gajabhuja (initiator) 408  
 Gāndhārī 173  
 Ghoṭamukhī hall 65  
 gnomic verses 90  
 Godha (ābhidharmika) 324  
 Godhāvāri 298  
 Guṇasobhana 302  
 Guttaṅka (monastery) 410, 413  
 hagiography 235, 244, 283  
 Hāla 107  
 Hamsavatī 270  
 handbook 86, 99 (ritual)  
 handbook for laymen 101, 386sq.  
 Haripuñjaya 426  
 Hatthagallavana 196  
 heretics 56, 150  
 Hindu law *see* Dharmasāstra  
 Hitopadeśa 423  
 Hsüan-tsang 272 n. 474  
 humour 108  
 image (first of the Buddha) 271  
 initiator (layman) 330  
 inscription (Bairāt) 86 n. 151, 97  
 inscription (Noen Sara Bua) 405  
 inscription (Pagan) 394, 409, 412,  
     418, 433sq., 445  
 inscriptions (Bhārhut) 112 n. 87  
 inscriptions 444–446  
 Irawaddy 347  
 Isidatta 72

items missing in AN 82

I-tsing 36 n. 70

Jambuddoṇi (monastery) 406

Jambūdīpa 414

Jambūvana (monastery) 170

Jātaka (different forms of in different schools) 113 n. 189

Jātaka aṭṭvā gaṭṭapadaya (261)

Jātakamālā 197

Jetavanavihāra (1) (donated by Anāthapiṇḍika) 111

Jetavanavihāra (2) (Anurādhapura) 43

Jetavanavihāra (3) (Bangkok) 199

Jetavanavihāra (4) (Polonnaruwa) 343, 373

Jīvaka (initiator) 227 (Mp)

Jotipāla (initiator) 227 (Spk, Mp)

jyotiḥśāstra 330, 401

Kadamba dynasty 329

Kādambarī 197

Kalabhra 329

Kalasapura 356, 368

Kaliṅga Mahāthera 413 n. 686

Kalyāṇī inscription 339, 446

Kāñcī 109, 207, 226sq., 348

Kandy 443

Kaṇhadāsa 298, 328

Kaṇṭakaselapaṭṭana 418

Kapilavatthu 64

Kappasutta (Jaina text) 38

Kārikā 160, 164, 167, 218

Kassapa (1)

(saṃghaparināyaka) 372

Kassapa (2) 441

Kātantra 304

Katikāvata 333

Kāverī 328, 354

Kāverīnagara 348

Kāverīpaṭṭana 298, 328, 348, 371

kāvya 191, 442

key words 21, 38, 60, 80, 105, 213, 216, 235, 238 n. 417, 240sq.

Khandhadhamma (monastery) 371

Khujjuttarā 79, 93, 277

Kittisena (minister) 287

Kitti Siri Meghavaṇṇa (king) 193

koṣa *see* dictionary

Kosala 57, 93, 271

Kosambi 57

Kumārājīva 171

Kumārakassapa (initiator) 262

Kuṇḍalakesivattthu 338, 449

Kuṇṭhalakeśī 449

lak-san<sup>3</sup> 344

Lamphun 426

language of the old Aṭṭhakathā 206, 231, 262

Laṅkā 414

layman 62

layman (manual for) 101, 386sq.

legend of the Buddha 59

letter 339, 438–443

“let than” 344

literary history by Buddhists 4

Li Thai (king) 396sq.

“little finger manuals” 344

location of Suttantas 57

logic (Indian) 149

Lohapāsāda 192

Lokaprajñapti 395

Lomasakaṅgiya 64

love song 61

Māgadhi 7

Māgadhism 146

Mahābhārata 70, 78, 95, 114, 270, 449

Mahābhāṣya 164

Mahācunda 66

Mahādhammarāja (king) 381

Mahākassapa 8, 64, 228

Mahākassapasīha Coḷa

(initiator) 330, 338

Mahākātyāyana 171

Mahāmeghavaṇṇavihāra 209

Mahānāgākula 441

Mahānāma (king) 207, 306

Mahāpajāpati Gotami 284

- Mahāprajñāpāramitāsāstra 171  
 Mahārakkhita 116  
 Mahāsāṅghikalokottaravādin 29  
 Mahāsāṅgītika 120  
 Mahāsena (king) 182, 184, 186, 250, 418  
 Mahāthūpa 192  
 Mahāvastu 125 n. 220, 395  
 Mahāvihāra 208, 227, 252, 261, 274, 283, 287, 348, 355, 372, 437, 439, 447  
 Mahinda 34, 133, 205, 212  
 Mahīśāsaka 261 n. 456  
 Maitreya 200  
 Māleyya Thera 435  
 Mallikā 81  
 Mānavuḷu (city) 441  
 Mandalay 382  
 Mandhātā 236  
 Maṅgala Mahāthera 413 n. 686  
 Mañimekhalā 195  
 manuscript tradition 6  
 manuscript (gold/silver folios) 6  
 manuscript (written during the lifetime of the author) 400  
 manuscripts (sent from Siam to Ceylon) 443  
 Manusmṛti 270  
 Māra 95  
 Marammadesa 402  
 Martaban 397  
 Mayūrapaṭṭana 227  
 Mayūraśarman (king) 329  
 measures and weights 390, 398  
 Medhaṃkara (Buddha) 124, 432 (Bodhi tree)  
 meditation (of the Buddha as a child) 66  
 Menandros 172  
 merit books 187  
 merit 227 (transfer), 409, 416  
 methods used in commentaries 214, 252, 281, 299  
 metre 62, 102 (āryā), 164 (āryā), 168 (āryā), 183 (Dīp), 185 (Mhv), 226 n. 398 (āryā)  
 Metteyya 124, 200sq., 407, 435  
 misunderstandings 23, 37  
 Moggallāna (I) 8, 25, 281  
 Moggallāna II. (2) (king) 291  
 Moggalliputtatissa 144  
 Moraṇḍakheṭṭaka 227, 274  
 muktaka (poetry) 107  
 Mūlasarvāstivādin 29sq., 36, 123, 165  
 music 61, 280 (Guttila-ja)  
 Muttama 397  
 Nāgajjunavihāra 354  
 Nāgānavihāra 354  
 Nāgapaṭṭana 362  
 Nāgārjuna 171  
 Nāgas 72  
 Nāgasena (I) 172, 175sq.  
 Nāgasena (2) 441  
 Nāgasena (3) 449  
 \*Nāgasenabhikṣusūtra 173  
 Nālandā Edition 5  
 Nāmasap 203  
 Namba (initiator) 345  
 Nandipariveṇa 343  
 Nārada 281  
 narrative literature 204sq.  
 Nātaputta 62  
 Nāthagupta (author) 449  
 Nibbāna (compared to a city) 436  
 novices 333  
 numerical arrangement of text 104, 139, 141  
 nuns 27, 31, 241  
 offence (gravity of depending on circumstances) 319  
 oral tradition 9, 49, 51  
 orality (fictitious, remembered) 55, 142  
 ordination (certificate of) 442  
 oriental catalogues 4 n. 10  
 oriental editions 5  
 Paccekabuddha (list of names) 303  
 Pā Dāng (monastery) 428  
 Pagan 327, 353, 401, 441 (*see also* inscription of)

Pāli 7, 206  
 Pāli Text Society 5  
 Panasārāma (monastery) 379  
 Pāṇini 233, 304, 366  
 Pañcatantra 270, 423  
 Parakkama (general, initiator) 193  
 Parakkamabāhu I. (king) 43, 210,  
 330, 334 (initiator of Pālim), 372,  
 375 (initiator of Mp-t), 378, 442  
 Parakkamabāhu II. (king) 197  
 Parakkamabāhu IV. (king) 109  
 Parakkamabāhu-Katikāvata 333  
 parallel texts (canonical) 34sq.  
 parallel texts (commentarial) 129,  
 239, 267  
 Pasenadi (king) 81, 201  
 Pāṭaliputta 65  
 Patañjali 164  
 Paṭṭakotti (monastery) 418  
 pattrikā (palm leaf slip) 240 n. 421  
 Pegu 270, 446  
 Phra Singh (monastery) 400  
 Pi-lē 171  
 Piṭakat samuñ (Piṭakat thamain) 4  
 poets (four classes) 81, 207  
 poetry 107 (secular), 108 (by  
 women)  
 Polonnaruva 343, 378  
 poṣadhapratisamyukta 29  
 Prachinipuri 405  
 Prajñāptiśāstra 143  
 prophecies 181  
 Pūjāvaliya 197  
 Pukkusaṭi 66  
 Pulatthinagara *see* Polonnaruva  
 Purāṇa 50sq.  
  
 quotations from the canon (not  
 verified) 117, 165  
 quotations within the  
 commentaries 238, 249  
 quotations within the Tipiṭaka 72,  
 80 n. 145, 98, 142, 148  
  
 Rājagaha/Rājagṛha 8, 64, 228, 310  
 Rājātirāja (king) 354

Rāma I. (king) 199  
 Rāmāyaṇa 114, 449  
 Ratanapura 336  
 Raṭṭhapāla (story) 23, 67  
 recension 109, 189 (Ja), 123, 273,  
 283, 286 (Ap), 128 (Cp)  
 recitation of texts 58, 109 (Ja)  
 redundancy avoided 281 n. 489  
 relics (division of) 192  
 Revata 327  
 Rīgveda 113  
 Rohaṇa 187, 407  
 Ruvanvāli-Stūpa 192  
 Ruyyaka, Alamkārasarvasva 240  
 n. 421  
  
 Sabbakāmin 227 n. 401  
 Saddhammaratana Buddhasīha  
 (initiator) 298  
 Saddhammaratnākaraya 385  
 Saddhammaratnāvaliya 269  
 Śaḍgatikārikā 394  
 śākhā (Vedic) 226 n. 399  
 Sāli 410  
 Salin 347  
 Sāliṛājakumāra 188, 410  
 Samavāyaṅga 78  
 Samāṇola 198  
 Samantakūṭa 198  
 Saṅgha reform 372sq.  
 Saṅghabhadra 209  
 Saṅghabhara 245 n. 427  
 Saṅghapāla (1) (initiator) 327  
 Saṅghapāla (2) (translator) (245)  
 Saṅghaviseṭṭha (initiator) 348  
 sannaya 203  
 Sanskrit kāvya 442  
 Sanskrit literature in Ceylon 403  
 n. 659  
 Saraṇaṃkara (Buddha) 124, 432  
 (Bodhi tree)  
 Śardūlavikrīḍita 403  
 Sāridhamma (monastery) 371  
 Sāriputta 8, 25, 62, 66, 70 n. 134, 119,  
 133, 155, 299  
 Sarvāstivāda 143, 145



- Sāvatti 57, 64, 75  
 sects (heretical) 56  
 Sena II. Sirisaṅghabodhi (king) 287  
 Sidatsaṅgarāva 413 n. 687  
 Siddhagāmapariveṇa 361  
 Sihaḷadīpa 259, 417  
 Sihaḷapotthaka 371  
 Sihaḷārāma 390  
 Sihasūra Siri  
     Tibhuvanādiccadhammarāja  
     (king) 379 n. 604  
 Simon Hewavitarne Bequest  
     Series 5  
 Siribhadda (initiator) 347 n. 564  
 Sirinivāsa (king) 207sq.  
 Sirinivāsa Sirisaṅghabodhi  
     (king) 287  
 Siri Saṅghabodhi (king) 196  
 Sīrisudhamma (king) 336  
 Sirivaḍḍhanapura (Kandy) 443  
 Śiṣyalekha 439  
 Sitāharapa 449  
 Sivijaya 431  
 Sīvāli 327  
 Sivatthera 42  
 skeleton texts 70, 134, 144, 237  
 slips, palm leaf 240  
 Soṇa (initiator) 221  
 Sovaṇṇamālithūpa 192  
 Sthānāṅga 78  
 strīdharmā 73  
 structure of commentaries 215, 225,  
     239–243  
 Stūpa 81  
 Subhāṣita 421  
 subcommentaries (chronology  
     of) 368–370  
 Sudhammavattī 270  
 Suddhasīla (initiator) 380  
 Sudinna 25  
 suicide 66  
 Sukhothai 397  
 Sumaṅgala Araññavāsini  
     (initiator) 330  
 Sumaṅgalapariveṇa 227  
 Sumedha (1) 111, 124  
 Sumedha (2) 373, 378 (initiator)  
 survey of research 3  
 sūtra 21, 131 (Vedic), 346  
 sūtranikāya 47 n. 88  
 Suttantas (number of in DN, MN,  
     SN, AN) 48, 77  
 Suttantas (apocryphal) 423sq., 436  
     sq.  
 Svan Khvan (monastery) 390  
 systematization of the teaching 71,  
     138  
 Tamba 348  
 Tambapaṇṇidīpa 227  
 Tambapaṇṇitthera 236  
 Tambara (Tammarā) (country) 402  
 (Taṃ)Guttavaṅga *see* Guttavaṅga  
 Tam Nak Sirimaṅgalācāryārāma  
     (monastery) 390 n. 631  
 Taṇhaṃkara (Buddha) 124, 432  
     (Bodhi tree)  
 Taṇja 348  
 Tāvattīmsa heaven 133  
 texts (later added to the canon) *see*  
     additions  
 texts (lost) 447 sq.  
 texts (titles of) 238  
 Tḥānaṅga 78  
 Thaton 270  
 Tibhuvanādiccadhammarāja  
     (king) 379 n. 604  
 Tīkā 203  
 Tilaka/Tiloka (king) 199, 379 n. 604,  
     428  
 time needed to complete a  
     book 209(Sp), 346 (Abhidh-  
     s-mhṭ), 379 (As-y)  
 Tipiṭaka (editions of) *see* editions  
 Tīrthaṃkara 124  
 Tissa (usurper) 320  
 titles of texts 238  
 Traibhūmikathā 385 n. 622, 396sq.  
 transfer of merit 227  
 translations into Pāli 394 (from  
     Skt.), 421 (from Sgh.), 426 (from  
     Thai)  
 Triṣṭubh 341, 408

- Udānavarga 89, 91  
 Uddaka Rāmaputta 66  
 Udumbara 402  
 Udyogaparvan (Mhbh) 78  
 Upagupta 395  
 Upāli 8, 42  
 Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra 44  
 Upaniṣad 91, 172  
 Upasena Vaṅgaputta (first offender) 25  
 Upatissa 368 (quoted in Vjb), 377 (quoted in Kkh-pt)  
 Urāgapura 328  
 Urayūr 328 n. 532  
 Uttaravihāra 184, 188  
  
 Vākyapadīya 365  
 variants quoted in Ja 261  
 Vasantatilaka 403sq.  
 Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya 320  
 Veda 51, 74, 107, 226 n. 399, 402  
 Veṇḥudāsa 298, 328  
 Vepacitti 74  
  
 Vesālī/Vaiśālī 31, 38, 228  
 Viduranṭivākya (Mhbh) 78  
 Vijaya 184  
 Vijayabāhu II., III. (kings) 406  
 Vijñānakāya 145, 150  
 Vimalakīrti 385  
 Vinaya material 67 (in MN), 74 (in SN), 80 (in AN)  
 vinayavastu 29  
 Vipassin (life of) 59  
 visit of the Buddha to Ceylon 198  
 visit of the Buddha to Siam 429  
 Viṭaṇḍavādin 130, 139, 310 n. 519, 448  
 vocabulary of the old  
     Aṭṭhakathā 249, 317  
 vrata formula (Vedic) 19 n. 38  
  
 women 73, 79, 317, 432 (Bodhisatta reborn as woman)  
 writing down of the Tipiṭaka 182  
  
 Xuanzang 272 n. 474  
 Yonaka (northern Siam) 442

## XVI.5 Modern Authors

- Adikaram, E. W. 205  
 Alsdorf, L. 35, 168  
  
 Bapat, P. V. 312  
 Barua, D. K. 50  
 Bechert, H. 169, 181, 421  
 Bode, M. 117, 419  
 Bollée, W. B. 368, 419  
 Bond, G. D. 158  
 Braun, H. 421  
 Bronkhorst, J. 138  
 Buddhadatta, A. P. 350  
  
 Cœdès, G. 391, 419  
 Chaudhuri, J. B. 108 n. 180  
 Cousins, L. 301  
  
 Demiéville, P. 172 n. 293  
 Deshpande, M. 180  
 Dietz, S. 438  
  
 Fausbøll, V. 88  
 Feer, L. 70  
 Filliozat, J. 3  
 Finot, L. 207  
 Franke, R. O. 50  
 Frauwallner, E. 32, 131, 184, 246  
 Fussman, G. 172 n. 294  
  
 Gard, R. A. 5  
 Geiger, W. 3, 181sq.  
 Gombrich, R. 271  
 Goonasekera, L. P. 205 n. 361  
  
 Hacker, P. 50, 60  
 Hardy, E. 168  
 Hazra, K. L. 3  
 Hewavitarna, S. 5

- Jacobi, H. 18  
 Jaini, P. S. 436
- Kieffer-Pülz, P. 211  
 Kirfel, W. 50
- Lamotte, É. 3, 32, 38  
 Law, B. C. 3  
 Lévi, S. 118  
 Lienhard, S. 107  
 Lottermoser, F. 205
- Malalasekera, G. P. 205, 419  
 Manné, J. 54  
 Matsumura, J. 410, 413  
 Mori, S. 205
- Ñāṇamoli 158, 168  
 Nevill, H. 439  
 Notton, C. 426  
 Norman, K. R. 3, 118
- Oldenberg, H. 50
- Pande, G. C. 50
- Penth, H. 428  
 Perera, F. 181
- Rahula, W. 412  
 Rhys Davids, C. A. F. 75  
 Rhys Davids, T. W. 5  
 Rohanadeera, M. 405 n. 663
- Saddhātissa, H. 202  
 Silva, L. de 366  
 Smith, H. 5  
 Stache-Rosen, V. 44  
 Supaphan na Bangchang 392, 419
- Turnour, G. 182 n. 310
- U Bokay 401
- Vadekar, R. D. 312
- Winternitz, M. 3  
 Woodward, F. L. 57  
 Wüst, W. 106 n. 177

## XVII. Abbreviations

### XVII.1 Pāli Texts

The system of abbreviations follows CPD (Epil.) and H. Bechert: Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien. Göttingen 1990. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden. Beiheft 3.

Akn	Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna
Aṭṭha-k	Aṭṭhakesadhātuvamṣa
Att	Haṭṭhavanagallavihāravamṣa
AN	Aṅguttaranikāya
Anāg	Anāgatavamṣa
Ap	Apadāna
Abn	Aḍḍhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna
Abhidh-av	Abhidhammāvatāra
Abhidh-s	Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha
Abhidh-sār	Abhidhammatthasārūpaka
As	Atthasālinī
Ākārav-s	Ākāravattārasutta
Utt-vn	Uttaravinicchaya
Ud	Udāna
Upās	Upāsakajanālaṅkāra
It	Itivuttaka
Kammav	Kammavācā
Kkh	Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī
Kbv	Kosalabimbavaṇṇanā
Kv	Kathāvatthu
Khuddas	Khuddakasikkhā
Khp	Khuddakapāṭha
Gv	Gandhavamṣa
Cakkav-d	Cakkavāḷadīpanī
Candas-d	Candasuriyadīpanī
Cdv	Cāmadevīvamṣa
Cp	Cariyāpiṭaka

Cha-k	Chakesadhātuvaṃsa
Cha-g	Chagatidīpanī
Ja	Jātaka
Jinak	Jinakālamālī
Jina-c	Jinacarita
Jina-b	Jinabodhāvalī
Jina-m	Jinamahānidāna
Jināl	Jinālaṅkāra
Jtn	Jātattakīnidāna
Tuṇḍ-s	Tuṇḍilovādasutta
Tel	Telakaṭṭhagāthā
Th	Theragāthā
Thī	Therīgāthā
Thūp	Thūpavaṃsa
Dasab	Dasabodhisattauddesa
Dasav	Dasadānavatthuppakaraṇa
Dāṭh	Dāṭhavaṃsa
Dīp	Dīpavaṃsa
DN	Dīghanikāya
Dbk	Dasabodhisattauppattikathā
Dbv	Dasabodhisattavidhi
Dhātuk	Dhātukathā
Dhn	Dhammanīti
Dhp	Dhammapada
Dhs	Dhammasaṅgaṇī
Nāmac	Nāmacāraḍipikā
Nāmar-p	Nāmarūpāpariccheda
Nāmar-s	Nāmarūpasamāsa
Nidd	Niddesa
Nibbāna-s	Nibbānasutta
Nett	Nettipakaraṇa
Pajj	Pajjamadhu
Pañca-g	Pañcagatidīpanī
Paṭip-s	Paṭipattisaṅgha
Paṭis	Paṭisambhidāmagga
Paṭṭh	Paṭṭhāna
Paṭham	Paṭhamasambodhi
Parit	Paritta
Pāc-y	Pācityādiyojanā
Pāt	Pātimokkhasutta
Pārup	Pārupanapāli
Pālim	Pālimuttakavinayavicchayaṅgha

Piṭ-sm	Piṭakat-samuiṇ
Peṭ	Peṭakopadesa
Pp	Puggalapaññatti
Ppk	Pañcappakaraṇa
Pbv	Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa
Pm-vn	Paramatthavinicchaya
Pv	Petavatthu
Ps	Papañcasūdanī
Bu-up	Buddhaghosuppatti
Bv	Buddhavaṃsa
Maṅg-d	Maṅgalatthadīpanī
Maṇis	Maṇisāramañjūsā
Manus	Manussavineyya
Mānāv-s	Mahānāgakulansandesa
Mil	Milindapañha
Mūla-s	Mūlasikkhā
Moh	Mohavicchedanī
Mth	Māleyyattheravatthu
MN	Majjhimanikāya
Mp	Manorathapūraṇī
Mhn	Mahārahanīti
Mhbv	Mahābodhivaṃsa
Mhv	Mahāvaṃsa
Mhv (Ext)	Extended Mahāvaṃsa
Mhv-ṭ	Vamsatthappakāsini
Yam	Yamaka
Ras	Rasavāhinī
Rūpār	Rūpārūpavibhāga
Rn	Rājanīti
Rb-v	Ratanabimbavaṇṇanā
Loka-d	Lokappadīpakasāra
Loka-n	Lokaneyyappakaraṇa
Loka-p	Lokapaññatti
Ln	Lokanīti
Vaṃsam	Vaṃsamālinī
Vin	Vinayaṭṭakā
Vin-vn	Vinayavinicchaya
Vibh	Vibhaṅga
Vim	Vimuttimagga
Vism	Visuddhimagga
Vess-dīp	Vessantaradīpanī
Vjb	Vajirabuddhi-ṭ
Vmv	Vimativinodanī

Vv	Vimānavatthu
Saṅkh-p	Saṅkhyāpakāsa
Sacc	Saccasaṅkhepa
Sadd	Saddanāṭi
Saddh	Saddhammopāyana
Saddh-s	Saddhammasaṅgaha
Saṇḍ-k	Saṇḍesakathā
Samantak	Samantakūṭṭavaṇṇanā
Sah	Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa
Sādh-u-c	Sādhucaritodaya
Simāl	Simālaṅkāra
Simāl-s	Simālaṅkārasaṅgaha
Simāv	Simāvivādaṇicchayakathā
Sīh	Sīhājavatthuppakaraṇa
Sutta-s	Suttasaṅgaha
Sgv	Saṅgītiyaṃsa
Sj-ja	Sivijayajātaka
SN	Samyuttanikāya
Sn	Suttanipāta
Sp	Samantapāsādikā
Spk	Sāratthappakāsinī
Sbn	Sihingabuddharūpanidāna
Smn	Sotthataki(mahā)nidāna
Sv	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī
Ss	Sārasaṅgaha

## XVII.2 General Abbreviations

Abbreviations such as “Edgerton 1953” refer to XV. Bibliography

-a	-aṭṭhakathā
AAWG,	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen.
AGWA	Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge
AKM	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
AMG	Annales du Musée Guimet
-anuṭ	-anuṭṭikā
AO	Acta Orientalia
AS	Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques
AWL	Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz.
	Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse,
	Jahrgang

B <sup>e</sup>	Burmese edition
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient
BEI	Bulletin d'Études Indiennes
BhīVin	Roth 1970
BHSD	Edgerton 1953
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BSR	Buddhist Studies Review
C <sup>e</sup>	Sinhalese edition
CPD	Trenckner 1924–1994
CPD (Epil.)	H. Smith: Epilegomena to CPD (I 1948)
E <sup>e</sup>	European edition
GGA	Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen
GM	Dutt 1939–1959
-gp	-gaṇṭhipada
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
Hôbôgin	Lévi/Takakusu/Demiéville 1929–1994
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly
IJJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
IT	Indologica Taurinensia
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JAs	Journal Asiatique
JBRs	Journal of the Burma Research Society
JIABS	Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies
JIH	Journal of Indian History
JIPh	Journal of Indian Philosophy
JOIB	Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda
JOR	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras
JPTS	Journal of the Pāli Text Society
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JSS	Journal of the Siam Society
K <sup>e</sup>	Kambodian edition
KZ	(Kuhns) Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung
Mhbh	Mahābhārata
-mḥṭ	-mahāṭikā
MSS	Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft
-mṭ	-mūlaṭikā
Mv	Mahāvastu
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse
NGWG	Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
-nṭ	-navaṭikā



ÖAW	Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
PBR	Pāli Buddhist Review
PED	Rhys Davids/Stede: 1921–1925
PEFEO	Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient
PTNB	Pāli Nīti Texts of Burma
PTS	Pāli Text Society
RV	Rgveda
SBE	Sacred Books of the East
S <sup>e</sup>	Siamese edition
Sgh.	Sinhalese
SHB	Simon Hewavitarne Bequest Series
StII	Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik
SWTF	Bechert/v.Simson 1973–1994
-ṭ	-ṭikā
-trsl	-translation
UCR	University of Ceylon Review
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
WZKS(O)	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- (und Ost)asiens
-y	-yojanā
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik

## XVIII. Additions and Corrections to the Numerical System of the Epilegomena to the CPD

Texts not mentioned in CPD (Epil.) have been given a number by expanding the system introduced by H. Smith.

### 1. Vinayapiṭaka

- 1.1,13 Kkh-y
- 1.2.12,1 Pāc-y
- 1.3.5,12 Pālim-nṭ
- 1.3.6.2 replaced by 1.3.5,12 (§ 334 n. 540)
- 1.4.4 Pārup

### 2. Suttapiṭaka

- 2.5.2,16 Dhp-a-y
- 2.5.10,13 Vess-dīp
- 2.5.10,2 Paññāsa-ja
- 2.5.10,3 Sḷ-ja
- 2.5.10,4 Smn
- 2.5.10,5 Jtn
- 2.6,1 Mil-ṭ
- 2.9.4<sup>3</sup> Paṭis-p
- 2.9.11<sup>2</sup> Jina-m
- 2.9.17<sup>2</sup> Cakkav-d
- 2.10 Nīti-tetxs
- 2.10.1 Dhṇ
- 2.10.2<sup>1</sup> Ln (1)
- 2.10.2<sup>2</sup> Ln (2)
- 2.10.3 Mhn
- 2.10.4 Rn
- 2.10.5 Loka-n
- 2.10.6 Manus
- 2.11 Apocryphal Suttas
- 2.11.1 Tuṇḍilovādasutta

- 2.11.2 Nibbānasutta
- 2.11.3 Ākāravattārasutta

### 3. Abhidhammapiṭaka

- 3.2,13 Vibh-ṭ
- 3.8.1,22 Abhidh-s-mhṭ-y
- 3.8.1,7 Abhidh-sār

### 4. History

- 4.1.2.1 ExtMhv
- 4.1.2.2 Vamsam
- 4.1.10,1 Ras-ṭ
- 4.1.11 Sīh
- 4.1.12 Sah
- 4.1.12,1 Sah-ṭ
- 4.1.13 Dasav
- 4.1.14 Mth-v
- 4.1.15 Aṭṭha-k
- 4.2.6 Mānāv-s
- 4.2.7 Cdv
- 4.2.8 Sbn
- 4.2.9 Rb-v
- 4.2.10 Akn
- 4.2.11 Abn
- 4.2.12 Pbv
- 4.2.13 Kbv
- 4.4.3 Dbk
- 4.4.3<sup>1</sup> Dbv
- 4.5.14 Jina-b